UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

*

MARINE BOARD OF INVESTIGATION *
INTO THE SINKING OF THE SCANDIES ROSE *
ON DECEMBER 31, 2019 *

*

Edmonds Center for the Arts Seattle, Washington

Wednesday, February 24, 2021

APPEARANCES:

Marine Board of Investigation

CAPT GREGORY CALLAHAN, Chairman CDR KAREN DENNY, Member LCDR MICHAEL COMERFORD, Member

Technical Advisors

LT SHARYL PELS, Attorney Advisor KEITH FAWCETT, Technical Advisor

National Transportation Safety Board

BARTON BARNUM, Investigator in Charge PAUL SUFFERN, Meteorologist

Parties in Interest

MICHAEL BARCOTT, Esq.
Holmes Weddle & Barcott
(On behalf of Scandies Rose Fishing Company, LLC)

NIGEL STACEY, Esq.
Stacey & Jacobsen PLC
(On behalf of survivors Dean Gribble and John Lawler)

Also Present

LT IAN McPHILLIPS, Recorder LCDR MATTHEW PEKOSKE, Judge Advocate JOSEPH STACEY, Esq.

I N D E X

<u>ITEM</u>	PAGE
Opening Remarks - Greg Callaghan, Chairman	392
Opening Remarks - Barton Barnum, NTSB	397
Examination of Paul Zankich, Bud Bronson, & Jonathon Parr	ott:
By CAPT Callaghan	403
By Mr. Barnum	438
By Mr. Barcott	447
By CAPT Callaghan	454
By LCDR Comerford	457
By CDR Denny	463
Examination of Cecily Lowenstein:	
By LCDR Comerford	479
By Mr. Barnum	505
By Mr. Stacey	518
Examination of John Lawler:	
By CAPT Callaghan	525
By Mr. Barnum	577
By CDR Denny	583
By CAPT Callaghan	608

2.5

PROCEEDINGS

(8:00 a.m.)

CAPT CALLAGHAN: It is 0800 on February 24, 2021, and this hearing is now in session. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

I'm Captain Greg Callaghan, United States Coast Guard, Chief of Prevention for the 11th Coast Guard District. I'm the chairman of this Coast Guard Marine Board of Investigation and presiding

8 officer over these proceedings.

The Marine Board has established a COVID mitigation plan to comply with federal, state and local requirements. As a result, no members of the public will be permitted to view this hearing in person. The Board will receive witness testimony through a hybrid of in-person, virtual, and telephonic means. Members of the Board have been spaced out far enough at the main table to remove their mask while seated to maximize clarity and minimize disruption.

Members are to place masks back on at any time when leaving the table and whenever approached by another person. I ask that anyone who is unable to maintain social distancing, please keep their mask on unless actively speaking into the microphones.

Due to the extensive technology used to support this hearing and the potential for unanticipated delays or challenges, I ask that you please be patient with us in the event of any disruptions.

The Commandant of the Coast Guard has convened this Board under the authority of Title 46 U.S.C. Section 6301 and Title 46

C.F.R. Part 4 to investigate the circumstances surrounding the sinking of the commercial fishing vessel *Scandies Rose* with the loss of five lives on December 31st, 2019, while transiting in the vicinity of Sutwik Island, Alaska. There were two survivors.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my condolences to the family and friends of the five crew members who were lost at sea. I note that many of you are watching this hearing on livestream due to the COVID restrictions in place, and we appreciate you being here with us.

Upon completion of the investigation, this Marine Board will submit its reported findings, conclusion, and recommendations to the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard. Other than myself, the members of this Board include Commander Karen Denny and Lieutenant Commander Michael Comerford. The legal counsel to this Board is Lieutenant Sharyl Pels. The recorder is Lieutenant Ian McPhillips. Coast Guard technical advisors to this Board are Mr. Scott Giard and Mr. Keith Fawcett. This Board's media liaison is Lieutenant Commander Scott McCann.

The National Transportation Safety Board is also participating in this hearing. Mr. Bart Barnum, Investigator in Charge for the NTSB's Scandies Rose investigation is here with us, along with Mr. Paul Suffern.

Witnesses are appearing before the Board to provide valuable information that will assist this investigation. We request that all members of the public be courteous to the witness and respect

their right to privacy.

2.5

The members of the press are welcome to attend virtually, and provisions have been made during the proceedings to allow the media to do so. The news media may question witnesses concerning the -- concerning the testimony they have given after I have released them from these proceedings. I ask that any such interviews be conducted with full consideration of the COVID mitigation procedures that this Marine Board has established.

The investigation will determine as closely as possible the factors that contributed to the incident so that proper recommendations for the prevention of similar casualties may be made; whether there is evidence that any act of misconduct, inattention to duty, negligence, or willful violation of the law on the part of any licensed and credentialed person contributed to the casualty; and whether there is evidence that any Coast Guard personnel or any representative or employee of any other government agency or any other person caused or contributed to the casualty.

The Marine Board planned this two-week period to examine all events relating to the loss of the *Scandies Rose* and five crew members. The hearing will explore crew member duties and qualifications, shore-side support operations, vessel stability, weather factors, effects of icing, safety equipment, the operations of the vessel from the past up to and including the accident voyage, and survey imagery of the vessel in its final

resting place. The hearing will also include a review of industry and regulatory safety programs, as well as the U.S. Coast Guard Search and Rescue activities related to the response phase of the accident after notification that the *Scandies Rose* was in distress.

2.5

The Coast Guard has designated parties in interest to this investigation. In Coast Guard marine casualty investigations, a party in interest is an individual, organization, or other entity that under the existing evidence or because of his or her position may have been responsible for or contributed to the casualty. A party in interest may also be an individual, organization, or other entity having a direct interest in the investigation in demonstrating the potential for contributing significantly to the completeness of the investigation or otherwise enhancing the safety of life and property at sea through participation as party in interest.

All parties in interest have a statutory right to employee counsel to represent them, to cross-examine witnesses, and have witnesses called on their behalf. Witnesses who are not designated as parties in interest may be assisted by counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their rights. However, such counsel are not permitted to examine or cross-examine other witnesses or otherwise participate in the investigation.

I will now read the list of those organizations and individuals whom I've previously designated as parties in

interest. Scandies Rose Fishing Company LLC, represented by counsel who are here in person today. Crew persons Mr. Dean Gribble and Mr. Jon Lawyer -- Lawler represented by counsel who are here in person today.

I have also decided that Mr. Bruce Culver, the Naval Architect who created the stability instructions for the Scandies Rose, meets the statutory definition of a party in interest to this investigation. Yesterday, I designated him as the fourth party in interest, joining the vessel owner and two surviving crew members. To afford Mr. Culver time to exercise his rights as a party in interest, I have postponed his testimony originally scheduled for today until later in the hearing. We will update the schedule, post it on livestream and Coast Guard media site with his -- new testimony time as soon as possible.

The Marine Board will place all witnesses under oath. When testifying under oath, a witness is subject to federal laws and penalties for perjury for making false statements under Title 18 U.S.C. Section 1001. Penalties could include a fine of up to \$250,000 or imprisonment of up to five years or both.

The sources of information to which this investigation will inquire are many and varied. Since the date of the casualty, the NTSB and Coast Guard have conducted substantial evidence collection activities, and some of that previously collected evidence will be considered during this hearing. Should any person have or believe he or she has information not brought

forth, but which might be of -- direct significance, that person is urged to bring that information to my attention by emailing uscg.scandiesrosembi@gmail.com. This email address will be continuously monitored.

Mr. Bart Barnum will now say a few words on behalf of the NTSB.

MR. BARNUM: Thank you, Captain Callaghan.

I am Bart Barnum, Investigator in Charge for the National Transportation Safety Board's investigation of this accident. The Safety Board is an independent federal agency which under the Independent Safety Board Act of 1974 is required to determine the cause or probable cause of this accident, to issue a report of facts, conditions, and circumstances relating to it, and make recommendations for measures to prevent similar accidents.

The NTSB has joined the hearing to avoid duplicating the development of facts. Nevertheless, I do wish to point out that this does not preclude the NTSB from develop -- developing additional information separately from this proceeding if that becomes necessary. At the conclusion of this hearing, the NTSB will analyze the facts of this accident and determine the probable cause independent of the Coast Guard.

At a future date, a separate report of NTSB's findings will be issued, which will include our official determination of the probable cause of this accident. If appropriate, the Safety Board will issue recommendations to correct safety problems discovered during this investigation. These recommendations might become -- might come in advance of the report.

In addition, on behalf of the NTSB, I would like to offer my deepest condolences for the families and those affected by this tragic accident. Thank you.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Mr. Barnum.

Yesterday, we heard from a representative from the National Weather Service and several industry personnel who had visited the vessel before the accident. Mr. Kerry Walsh from Global Diving walked us through his company's ROV expedition to locate the wreckage of the vessel and survey the area.

Today, we will speak to several professional engineers regarding vessel stability. This afternoon, we will hear from Mr. John Lawler, one of the two survivors of the *Scandies Rose* marine casualty, who will describe his firsthand account of the incident.

At this time, this hearing will go into recess and resume at 0830.

(Off the record at 8:10 a.m.)

(On the record at 8:30 a.m.)

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. The time is 0830. This hearing is now back in session. We will now hear from Mr. Paul Zankich, Mr. Bud Bronson, and Mr. Jonathan Parrott, all naval architects and professional engineers.

Gentlemen, at this time, Lieutenant McPhillips will

administer your oath and ask each of you some preliminary 1 2 questions. 3 Lieutenant McPhillips? 4 LT McPHILLIPS: Gentlemen, please stand and raise your right 5 hand. 6 (Whereupon, 7 PAUL ZANKICH, BUD BRONSON, AND JONATHON PARROTT 8 were called as witnesses and, after being first duly sworn, were 9 examined and testified as follows:) 10 LT McPHILLIPS: Okay. You may be seated -- you may be seated. I will be asking each of you questions about your 11 12 background, starting with Mr. Zankich. 13 Mr. Zankich, please state your full name and spell your last 14 name. 15 (No audible response). 16 LT McPHILLIPS: You're on mute, sir. 17 MR. ZANKICH: My name is Paul -- Luke Paul Zankich. Can you hear me? 18 LT McPHILLIPS: Yes, sir. Can you please spell your last 19 20 name? MR. ZANKICH: Z-a-n-k-i-c-h. 21 22 LT McPHILLIPS: Please identify counsel or representative if 23 present. 24 MR. ZANKICH: None. 25 LT McPHILLIPS: Please tell us what is your current

employment and position? $\label{eq:mr} \mbox{MR. ZANKICH: I am a naval architect/marine engineer at}$

LT McPHILLIPS: What are your general responsibilities in that job?

MR. ZANKICH: I do engineering calculations and go out to, to job sites. Yesterday, I was out setting up for a stability test Friday for the U.S. Coast Guard.

LT McPHILLIPS: Can you briefly tell us your relevant work history?

MR. ZANKICH: What was that, sir?

Columbia-Sentinel Engineers in Seattle.

LT McPHILLIPS: Briefly tell us your relevant work history.

MR. ZANKICH: I graduated University of Michigan in 1966 with a BA -- or BE in naval architecture and marine engineering. I went to work for the Boeing Company designing their hydrofoils for six years. In '72, I went to Todd Shipyards as their chief naval architect. In '78, I went to Marine Power Equipment Company as the chief engineer. And in '86, I joined Columbia-Sentinel Engineers as a partner in the company.

LT McPHILLIPS: What is your education related to your position?

MR. ZANKICH: I think I said I have a Bachelor of Science of Engineering in 1966 from Michigan.

LT McPHILLIPS: Do you hold any professional licenses or certificates related to your position?

MR. ZANKICH: Yes, I have a professional engineer's license 1 2 from the State of Washington. 3 LT McPHILLIPS: Thank you, sir. Mr. Bronson, please identity counsel or representative, if 4 5 present? 6 MR. BRONSON: None. 7 LT McPHILLIPS: Please state your full name and spell your 8 last name. 9 MR. BRONSON: Boston E. Bronson, B-r-o-n-s-o-n. 10 LT McPHILLIPS: Please tell us what is your current 11 employment and position. MR. BRONSON: Naval architect in private practice where I go 12 under the company name of Bronson Marine. I do naval architecture 13 14 and marine engineering for various clients that I've had over the 15 years who still need my services on occasion. 16 LT McPHILLIPS: What are your general responsibilities in 17 that job? MR. BRONSON: Pretty much anything in general naval 18 architecture and marine engineering. Currently, I'm assisting a 19 20 gentleman who has a 205-foot (indiscernible) in New Zealand, essentially rebuilding it after a massive collision at sea. 21 22 LT McPHILLIPS: What is your education related to your 23 position? 24 I have a Bachelor of Science from U.S. Naval MR. BRONSON:

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

Academy 1961. During my time in the service, I went to U.S. Navy

25

Nuclear Power School, which is a one-year course in theoretical and practical and nuclear engineering. In 1971, I went to the University of Michigan, and I have a Master of Science in Engineering and Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering from, from that institute.

LT McPHILLIPS: Do you hold any professional licenses or certificates related to your position?

MR. BRONSON: I'm a registered PE in the State of Washington and have been for almost 50 years. And I used to have -- hold a master's license, but I gave that up about ten years ago because I've got -- can't stand up in the seaway anymore.

LT McPHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Bronson.

Mr. Parrott, please state your full name and spell your last name.

MR. PARROTT: Jonathan Parrott. Last name is P-a-r-r-o-t-t.

LT McPHILLIPS: Please identify counsel or representative, if present.

MR. PARROTT: None present.

LT McPHILLIPS: Please tell us, what is your current employment and position?

MR. PARROTT: I'm senior naval architect at Crowley Engineering Services. It used, it used to be called Jensen Maritime.

LT McPHILLIPS: What are your general responsibilities in that job?

Currently, I do preliminary design, concept 1 MR. PARROTT: 2 design for various tugs, vessels, barges. 3 LT McPHILLIPS: Can you briefly tell us your relevant work history? 4 5 MR. PARROTT: Joined Jensen Maritime in 1979 after graduating school and been working with them for 42 years. I've done 6 7 everything from stability work to running the company as president and now as a senior naval architect. 8 9 LT McPHILLIPS: What is your education related to your 10 position? MR. PARROTT: Graduated in 1979 from Webb Institute of Naval 11 Architecture with a BSE in Naval Architecture and Marine 12 13 Engineering. 14 LT McPHILLIPS: Do you hold any professional licenses or 15 certificates related to your position? 16 MR. PARROTT: Yes, I have a PE license in, in the State of Washington for Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering. 17 LT McPHILLIPS: Thank you, gentlemen. Captain Callaghan will 18 now have follow-up questions for you. 19 20 EXAMINATION OF PAUL ZANKICH, BUD BRONSON, AND JONATHON PARROTT CAPT CALLAGHAN: Good morning, gentlemen, and thank you for 21 22 being with us this morning. If at any point we ask any questions 23 that you don't understand or cannot hear because of technical

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

difficulties, please don't hesitate to say so, and we'll repeat or

rephrase the question. As of right now, we have you scheduled to

24

2.5

run from -- 0830 until 10 a.m.

What we'll do is -- the way I'd like to try and do this is really split it into two, two parts and maybe take a five minute recess through the middle. We'll -- what we'll plan on doing is we'll go around for at least one round of questions from myself, National Transportation Safety Board, and then the parties in interest. And then what we'd like to do is make it a discussion panel to really gain as much as we can from you gentlemen and your professional backgrounds.

So using the Zoom platform, we have the ability to share exhibits virtually. The recorder, Lieutenant McPhillips, will pull any necessary exhibits up on your virtual desktop. If at any point you need to point something out on an exhibit, Lieutenant McPhillips can highlight the area for the benefit of the Board and the livestream audience. When we look at these exhibits, please take your time to refresh your memory or acquaint yourself with the information.

Given, given the, the virtual platform, it could -- we may experience some difficulties, so I'll ask that you please be patient with us. And then just, again, let us know if there's any clarification that you need or if you're having any difficulty on your end, and we can make some adjustments as necessary.

As we introduce exhibits, we'll give you time for it to pull up on your screen and to review it before commenting.

So starting with Mr. Zankich, I know we got a basic

background from you, and so I wanted to try and get a little more detail. Sir, can you please talk about your background, particularly in detail relating to any work you've done relating to commercial fishing vessels that work in the Pacific Northwest or Alaskan waters?

2.5

MR. ZANKICH: Yes. I should start by saying, when I graduated from Michigan, my final design project was a 100-foot king crab fishing vessel that I presented to the class, and I subsequently presented a student paper on that in the Pacific North section of the -- Pacific Northwest section of the Society of Naval Architecture Marine Engineer.

From that time forward, I dabbled in the fishing industry until 1977, I guess, and started doing some stability work on shrimp boats that were coming around from the Gulf to become king crab boats in the Northwest and also worked on several king crab vessel designs. My design was a house aft vessel, and most of the northwest boats at that time were house forward vessels, and I blatantly declared them to be unsafe because the captain could not see the crew on deck while they were working on the crab pots.

From that time forward, I've done I would say maybe dozen and a half, two dozen king crab stability tests on vessels and written the current stability books and delivered it to the owners. Other than that, we do at Columbia-Sentinel work on refurbishing vessels, so we get called by shipyards to, to correct deficiency on vessels, and many of them are king crab vessels.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you for that, sir. I have one follow
up with -- relating to the stability instructions that you've gone
on commercial fishing vessels. Can, can you tell us how recent
the last stability inspection you did on a commercial fishing
vessel?

MR. ZANKICH: It was within the last six months. We sponsoned the vessel -- did the design of the sponson of the vessel. And after the sponsoning, we did a stability test and wrote -- rewrote the current stability book for that vessel.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Bronson, I want to pass the same question over to you, sir, and ask you to talk about your background, particularly in detail relating to work that you've done relating to commercial fishing vessels working in the Pacific Northwest or Alaskan waters.

MR. BRONSON: When I graduated from Michigan, I was hired by Tacoma Boat Building company, which was located, obviously, in Tacoma, and we did — at that time, we did mainly vessels that were in the tuna industry. So it wasn't until I left Tacoma Boat in 1980 and opened my own office in Seattle that I started doing my — doing much work in, in the Pacific Northwest. I've done stability work on several crabbers, longliners. My firm, Bronson Marine — well, Bronson and Windsor at the time, worked on a 340-foot factory trawler called Arctic Storm, which was the first big factory trawler done in the — in, in years in this area.

And I've done a lot of stability work and other odds and ends 1 2 for people up in the, in the North Pacific area until about 2000, at which time Mr. Windsor and I decided he wanted to retire 3 because he was old. And I went to work for Martinac Shipbuilding 4 5 down in Tacoma. Again, I went back to doing general naval 6 architecture, and the fishing vessels we worked on, again, were, were tuna sangers (ph.). But my time in -- from 1980 to 2000, I was off and on out to Dutch Harbor and all sorts of areas out, out 8 9 west doing miscellaneous work for boats.

For a time period -- I think it was from about 1990 to 1995, I taught the stability course for North Pacific fishing vessel owners. It was a one week course for, for, for masters. Since, since I quasi-retired from Martinac in 19 -- or in 2009 or '10, all my previous clients in other areas found I was around and so I -- I'm, I'm working off and on for different people doing odds and end for them, like this one down at New Zealand. We're working on this vessel that's been seriously damaged.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And, and how recent would you say your work is with -- on crab fishing vessel stability?

MR. BRONSON: Crab fishing stability, 1995 up to 2000 or something like that. Once I went to work for, for Martinac, I've, I've done nothing for crab -- crabbing vessels since that time.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Mr. Bronson.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

So I'm going to shift over to you, Mr. Parrott, ask you to talk about your background in detail, particularly relating to

work that you've done relating to commercial fishing vessels that work in the Pacific Northwest or Alaskan waters.

MR. PARROTT: There -- yeah, Jensen was one of the prime designers of fishing boats for the Pacific Northwest when I joined them in 1979. They were -- at the tail -- when I joined, it was at the tail end of the first series of, of crab boom -- building boom for crab vessels, and we were just wrapping up a series of 117-foot crab vessels that were being built at Nichols Brothers.

For the first seven years that I worked for Jensen, being the junior naval architect, I got to do a lot of the inclines and stability write-ups for the boats, crabbers -- mostly crabbers and then we switched over to trawlers. Since that time, we've grown, I've gotten out of the stability work, but I still consult with the stability group in, in the company.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Sir, and, and how recent would you say your work is stability related for crabbing vessels?

MR. PARROTT: Personally, I probably haven't done a stability report in about 15 years. But we have ongoing stability work with the, with the team and the company. Inclined a boat last week. Currently working on a couple of other crabbers.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. The next is a series of questions I'm going to ask and I'll ask that one of you answer. And so all of you have mentioned being certified professional engineers, and so I just want to ask background on that. So, when you initially got your professional engineer certifications, can you tell us what

the requirements were -- are to, to earn that professional engineering certification?

2.5

MR. ZANKICH: This is Mr. Zankich. I got my license in, I think, 1969, and you had to have four years of college education and four years of working under a professional engineer to get your eight years, I think it was, qualification. Shortly thereafter -- no, not shortly, but maybe ten years thereafter, I worked and had a contract with the State of Washington to write their PE exam for naval architecture and marine engineering. They were the only state in the nation that offered that license, and people would fly from around the United States to the State of Washington to take the exam.

And that was a -- we'll call it a storybook problem rather than the multiple guess that now the PE exam is. And when I was the National Vice President of the Society of Naval Architecture, representing the northwest, I instituted on the national level with NCEES, the National Counsel of Engineering Examiners, or whatever it is, and helped them make a national exam that is now offered in all the states that the Board want to proffer it to. And I still, every year or every two years, for Society of Naval Architects, review the exam. And I've taken it several times since. And regretfully, I probably wouldn't pass it now because I've been out of school long enough and I've been channeled away from some of the majors or minors that are in that exam. But I know what's on that exam because I've been writing corrections for

it for many, many years.

2.5

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you for that, sir. And so this goes to talk to -- speak to your experience on the -- from the certification side of it. And so all three of you being certificated in the State of Washington, can you tell -- are there specific requirements for Professional Engineering Certification for the State of Washington?

MR. BRONSON: If I can answer it, they're pretty much the same. Four years of, of graduate work and four years -- or four years of college and four years of experience and cert -- recommendations by a couple of professional engineers that you're qualified to take the exam. And then, now, everybody goes through NCEES. That's an organization back on the East Coast that writes all the professional engineers for all of professional engineering societies: civil, naval architect, electrical, nuclear, all like that.

As with Mr. Zankich, back in the, in the '80s and '90s, I also helped occasionally to write questions for the exam and, and he and I've both sat down and spent afternoons grading exams. Now it's, it's still a written exam, but in -- the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers are in the process of, of converting theirs to a computer generated exam. And I'm working with the NCEES group in writing that -- the exam questions. And the biggest problem we have is writing the reference -- the electronics reference book for it.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Sir, for the benefit of the public, can you, can you tell us what the NCEES stands for?

2.5

MR. BRONSON: I think it's the National Society for Engineering and Surveying. It covers all professional engineering and, and surveyors.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you. And since -- so my next question is in regards to maintaining your professional engineering certification once you've obtained your initial certification.

What are the requirements to maintain that over time?

MR. ZANKICH: This is Mr. Zankich. Presently, there are no requirements for follow-up education or certification in the State of Washington.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: So I'm led to believe, then, that once you have it, it's good for life?

MR. ZANKICH: Yes, as long as you pay your due.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And can any of you recall what the, the current dues are for the State of Washington?

MR. PARROTT: I believe they're like \$125 annually.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Thank you. So, in regards to some of the tools you use in your professional engineering and your naval architecture work, is there a series of software that you particularly use regarding stability?

MR. ZANKICH: This is -- this is Mr. Zankich. We use GHS, General Hydrostatics. It used to be called BHS, Bill Plice (ph.) (indiscernible) program for doing our calculations and such.

That's the, that's the one, one stability program we use.

2.5

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And are, are you aware over time, you know, how it -- is, is that a continuously updated software?

MR. PARROTT: Yes, they're, they're continually updating and, and adding features for analysis of stability.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you. Would you see -- so in, in your professional opinion, would you see the -- you know, an importance in maintaining that software up to date over time?

MR. BRONSON: Yes, it, it -- yes, this is Mr. Bronson. Yes, and, and, and Bill Plice and the people at GHS have made continual improvements. When it started off, it was SCEND and you had to, to send them your raw data and they developed all your the programs and sent you the results back. And eventually GHS was developed, in which now we can enter the, the data and, and do the calculations ourselves directly. It's -- it, it -- because of my background in the Navy, I saw the old Navy computer program that we, we used back in the '60s and '70s, and GHS is just hands down better than, than that. It's exquisite.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Do you think you could reliably enter stability information and come up with a good stability analysis using outdated software?

MR. ZANKICH: This is Paul Zankich. Yes, I think you could, particularly in Bill Plice's program. There have been -- there, there may have been very few changes to the basic formulas, things for calculating KG or GM or things like that. There's lots of

subprograms in there now where you can make modifications. But once you get the model made, that model hasn't changed in the way it's made in many, many years. And if you're going to run (indiscernible) under the righting arm curve or, or predict where it's going to cross the curve, I don't think that has changed in the program hardly any over the years.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PARROTT: This is Jonathan Parrott. We have, in the past, discovered some bugs in the system, which we've gone back to Bill Plice and his group and they've corrected and, and updated. Whether these changes are major or minor, I don't know, but I would say, if the program is -- hasn't been updated in ten years, it's probably okay. Anything older than that, there may be some, some minor computation issues in it.

MR. BRONSON: Oh, and this is Mr. Bronson. The -- GHS comes out with periodic updates. You get a note from them that says, here's your new version, load it.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Is, is there a cost associated with the update?

MR. BRONSON: Yeah. If, if you're the right age, no. If you're the wrong age -- I'm -- I've been with them since about 1974. Eventually they said, Bud, you've paid us enough. We'll just update your copy for free. But most people spend I think a couple hundred dollars a year updating it.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay, gentlemen, so, as naval

architects and I think, you know -- so one of the most serious considerations in, in vessel design is the stability characteristics of the vessel. So looking specifically to the crabbing boats that operate on the Bering Sea, what would be the characteristic that you would be looking for in designs in general?

MR. PARROTT: This is Jonathan. We'd be looking at adequate free board to, to keep the water off the deck in heavy weather. Crew comfort, adequate working around the engine room, sufficient capacity so that the apex (ph.) of the vessel is within reason. And then adequate features for -- to, to maintain the safety of the crew.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. So, gentlemen, I'd like to ask you, I guess, to kind of walk us through the process, once you get the call to come out and assess stability for a vessel. And let's use a crabbing vessel as an example. Once you get that call, can you walk us through the process to, to create that stability instruction?

MR. ZANKICH: This is Mr. Zankich. It's very important to gather as much information as you can about the vessel: the vessel's shape, where the bulkheads are, where the decks are. And, and you can then create a model of the vessel in GHS. But sometimes drawings aren't available on vessels, and sometimes you have to dry dock the vessel and scan the outside of the vessel to get the shape so you can get a relatively accurate model of the

vessel.

We quite often have to go out and measure the interior of vessels to make sure things haven't moved around over the years since it was designed and built. We maintain a file here of, I don't know, ten files -- ten (indiscernible) file cabinets of drawings on vessels. And we can quite often find a sister vessel to that vessel or that vessel's original drawings to help us create the model. And therefore, once we have enough data on the model, we can go to the vessel, do what's called a dead weight survey, take the pre-boards on the vessel, we can determine how much it displaces, and then we can do a stability test on the vessel, moving weights on deck to determine where the vertical center and the longitudinal center of gravity is.

Once we establish that, then we can go into the GHS Program with that data and give it the standards that the Coast Guard has for these vessels. And those standards have definitely changed over the years for king crab vessels, so you have to get the current standards in there, area under the curve and max righting arm and all the limits in correctly. And then you can run it. You can look at the profile, establish how much area there is for windage, how much area there is for icing both vertical and horizontal. You have to check the pre-board, as Jonathan said, because that's one of the critical things. You have to look for downflooding points on the vessel to see where, if the vessel trims or lifts, if there's going to be any downflooding into

compartments in the vessel. And so it's quite a process to gather the -- enough information on the vessel to proceed with a stability evaluation.

2.5

Then you have to talk to the owner or the operator, what's he going to do with the boat? Is he going to carry a tremendous loud of pots, and what kind of pots? Six by six, seven by seven, eight by eight? Are they going to weigh 650, 750, 850, 950? How is he going to stack them, vertically or horizontally? You have to talk to him about what liquid loads he's going to have aboard. Is he going to go out with all tanks full of fuel? Does he keep some of the tanks full of fuel all the time and basically use them as ballast? Is he going to go out with -- full of water? Is he going to go out with his crab tanks full? Does he have one, two or three crab tanks in there? Does the circulating water system on those tanks come from different pumps, or do they have alarms on them that say when they're not running?

It's quite a process to gather enough information to proceed with the stability review on the vessel. And Bud and Jonathan may have more to add to that.

MR. PARROTT: No, that pretty much covers it. The, the -what usually happens is, is our team will go out the day before
the incline and visit with the vessel, make sure everything's
cleaned up, boat's in good shape for the incline. Most of the
boats we do now are either load line, so the ABS inspectors is
there during the incline, or it's an ACSA boat, which is a U.S.

Coast Guard program for fishing vessels where they'll have a Coast Guard inspector aboard during the incline. But pretty much, as Paul said, it's gathering information on the boat, how the boat is operated. Primarily, really important to find out where openings are that could allow water into the watertight envelope.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And you mentioned the inclining. Can you, can you just briefly tell us what's, what's required to conduct the inclining portion for that?

MR. BRONSON: This is Mr. Bronson. You take a known weight or weights and move them transversely, port -- centerline to port, port to centerline, centerline to starboard, starboard to centerline. You make sure that you get a straight line, that you haven't got something crazy going in there. And then, using the GHS software, it's pretty straightforward to find out what the displacement is at that particular loading condition.

And then, going through the vessel, you find out what isn't part of light ship, tanks that are filled, things like that, and go back and, from that, deduct what's necessary and come up with light ship. And then go back and sit down with the owners and find out what he's going to use on the vessel, what he's going to put on and off, and calculate all the different loadings conditions that are, that are necessary. IMO and the Coast Guard have a set of standard conditions that we're supposed to look, like ready for sea or live (audio skip) the grounds departure with a full load, departure with a partial load. There's a pretty set

-- a pretty thick set of conditions that we need to look at, and then we need to talk to the owner and find out if he's going to do anything else that's different than that.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. And so what would -- would you have -- what would your expectation be for revisiting a vessel to conduct a new stability examination after, say, a period of 30-plus years?

MR. PARROTT: That's always been a contention on, I think, all the naval architects trying to figure out when the proper interval is to reincline a boat. Based on multiple studies, boats are always gaining weight, anywhere from a half a percent to a percent and a half a year. And I think ABS has come up with standards for five or ten years between looking at stability to see if there's any major weight changes. There's also -- any modifications to the boat that are beyond a certain percentage of weight of the vessel requires either a new dead weight survey, but some reevaluation of stability.

There are quite a few boats out there that have 20, 30 year old stability tests, and they're -- they have based on pot rates that were valid way back when. Most of the pots have gained weight significantly. And up to a couple of years ago, the Coast Guard up in Dutch Harbor had a program where they would go down and weigh the boats -- pick a couple of boats, weigh the pots that were going on the boats, compare them to the stability booklet, and if there were significant weight differences, they would hold

the boat until the stability booklet was updated.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay.

2.5

MR. BRONSON: This is Mr. Bronson. If you look at the instructions to the master, which is one of the first pages in a stability -- studying a stability report, almost always the last line says, any changes to the configuration or the weight or -- voids the stability booklet. That's one of the biggest challenges is to get people to understand that going from 200-pound pots to 250-pound pots, you need someone to reexamine your stability.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Can --

MR. BRONSON: I mean, it's not, it's not constrained to the crabbing industry. All the fishing vessels are that way.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Lieutenant McPhillips, can you pull up Exhibit 36 please, particularly page 5? This is the stability instructions, directions to the master. So looking at these instructions to the master for the *Scandies Rose*, is this a standard -- is this, is this standard that you would normally use in your stability booklets?

MR. ZANKICH: This is Mr. Zankich. We might have it in different sequences and such and we might have several different words in here, but, but the -- the coverage of the subjects is generally the same.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Is there --

MR. PARROTT: Yeah, we would, we would -- I mean, we would add probably a little bit more descriptive of the crab pots and,

and actual dimensions, but other than that, our, our letters are a little bit longer. They're a little bit more wordy, but we generally cover the same, same items.

2.5

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Is there a standard anywhere for what they
-- what is required or what is normally included in these
instructions to the master?

MR. PARROTT: Not that I'm aware of. There would be -- if, if the boat was a load line boat, ABS would have certain standards as to how the, the letter is written and what's included. But other than that, no, there are not.

MR. ZANKICH: Looking, looking at this in front of me -- this is Mr. Zankich -- I don't see any directions in here as to sequence of burn of tanks, which sometimes is critical in the conditions evaluated where you need -- you can't have -- can't be moving fuel around from one tank to another. He talks about, do not operate with a slack, partially filled hold. That's a good thing to say, but sometimes that hold has to be pumped down or pumped up.

And years ago, when I was writing these without a whole lot of direction from the Coast Guard, I had a line in here that said, if your crab tank is not pressed full or empty, you should put the nose of your vessel into the weather until you can either get it full or empty. Because usually in the -- that transition period from full to empty can drastically affect the operation or the stability of the vessel. So we tell the master to put his nose

into the weather and then pump it down or pump it up, but don't be operating with it slack.

We also sometimes have in here burn sequences on the tanks where we tell them, don't fill the number three crab hold forward until the number one or number two are full. You can get yourself out of trim; you can get yourself with lots of free surface. So it's really, really important to tell the operator how he's going to operate the vessel, and he may have told you how he's going to operate it, so you want to parrot back at him.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you.

2.5

Lieutenant McPhillips, you can pull that exhibit down please. So continue on, looking specifically at the *Scandies Rose* -Lieutenant McPhillips, could you please pull up Exhibit 014
please, page 1? This, this was a picture of the vessel. Are, are you gentlemen familiar with the design -- such design as the *Scandies Rose*?

MR. ZANKICH: Looks like a house aft crabber.

MR. PARROTT: Yeah, it's, it's a pretty typical house aft crabber design. We actually did an incline on a sister vessel.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And so, you say did an incline on a sister vessel. Does that mean you issued the stability instructions for that vessel?

MR. PARROTT: Yes, this would have been quite a while ago. We're not sure. We, we provided that information to the Coast Guard early on in the investigation, but I'm not -- offhand, I

can't remember the name of the boat or the date that we did the incline.

2.5

CAPT CALLAGHAN: So just looking at this particular design, will you -- can you comment on some of the particular positive characteristics in terms of stability, vessels like the *Scandies Rose*?

MR. PARROTT: I mean, one, one of the things that, that we noticed on these types of boats is because they have buoyancy back aft with the deck house and forward with the fo'c'sle, it's that they generally tend to be very stable boats. Their pot loads are limited by the ability to see out of the pilot house, so it's somewhat difficult to -- well, it used to be somewhat difficult to overload the boats. We, we -- early on, when we were doing stability, we could get the boats with their decks awash still to meet the stability criteria, and that's when we started instituting a minimum free board for the boats. But generally, the boats are very good crabbers, very -- you know, with very good stability characteristics.

MR. ZANKICH: What Jonathan is taking reference to I think is, as the boat heels to the port or starboard with the raised deck forward and house aft, you could pick up buoyancy as you roll to port or to starboard, whereas if they were flush decked, you don't pick it up from those two raised areas. And that'll give you interesting righting arm curves because you start to pick up that buoyancy at 30 degrees heel or 35 degrees heel or something.

1 So it pushes your righting arms out there. But it's -- these are 2 generally very stable vessels.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Conversely, what would be -- in your professional opinion, what are the -- would be the -- any negative concerns with stability of a vessel like this in -- operating in the Bering Sea or Alaskan waters?

MR. ZANKICH: Well, I see on the -- it must be the starboard side here, the area where they operate the -- it must be the pots. And that's unusual to have that, you might say, as low as it is. But -- so you could be pretty wet there in the sea.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And so, again, looking at this photo and going to your professional opinion, what do you think operating it in the, in the waters of -- off Alaska could be the major factors that can affect erosion of positive stability for a vessel like this?

MR. ZANKICH: Ice, ice, ice.

MR. PARROTT: Either that or water on deck. A lot of these vessels have, have high wing walls. You can see where back aft of the pat hauling station, the side of the vessel goes up to the — to level with the first gear of flat pots. You can — if, if you don't put enough frame ports into that area, you, you — there's a possibility that you can accumulate water on deck. Typically, it wouldn't be too much of an issue with these boats, but there is a possibility of that happening.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. I'm going to ask Lieutenant

McPhillips, if you could pull up Exhibit 40 please, page 47. These are the icing portions of the regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations. Okay. Has it, has it come up for you, gentlemen?

MR. PARROTT: Yes.

2.5

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Are you gentlemen familiar with these?

MR. PARROTT: Very much so.

MR. ZANKICH: Yes.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And would you -- in terms of calculating stability, would you say that these are the -- the calculations here are conservative in nature?

MR. ZANKICH: No.

MR. PARROTT: I would have to agree with Mr. Zankich.

There's certainly been documentation that the ice accumulation is, is -- can be much greater. The icing -- these icing calculations also do not take into account the fact that icing will most likely accumulate more on one side of the vessel than the other, which, which would add a heeling moment to the, to the stability icing.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: So --

MR. ZANKICH: One of the problems with this verbiage and everything about the ice in these rules is that you can leave port -- not on a sunny day (indiscernible) but maybe -- and head out to the grounds, and you could start experiencing icing conditions, and you can't do anything about it other than get out baseball bats and try and break it, because you can't get rid of the pots

because they're all iced in place.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Right.

2.5

MR. ZANKICH: And so the accumulation can continue over and over and over again, and you cannot -- you can stick your nose into the wind and try and get that off center icing that was mentioned, but that's not maybe the direction you're going to your grounds. So the fact that you started icing while you were away from the dock, another problem is you were sitting at the dock maybe for a week before you went out. The boat is cold, cold, cold, and you go out and the first spray you hit forms ice on the boat and starts locking your pots in right then. You can't get rid of them anymore. You're stuck. So you either find some way to get rid of the pots, which you can't because they're all iced in place, or you get back to a port where you get into safe harbor or somehow. You're an accident looking for a place to happen. You've got to find a way out of it.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: So, gentlemen, based on the assumptions for the requirements within these standards, looking at this and trying to calculate it in terms of stability, is this -- are these assumptions made, I guess, in what would be assumed as like a shoebox like assumptions where all the weight's being on vertical and horizontal surfaces? Is that approach accurate for vessels with pot loads onboard?

MR. ZANKICH: Well, the others can talk to that, but I've sent this Coast Guard group that you're in photographs of pots

that were iced, and they look like a solid block of ice. And I've also see [sic] on your site advertising this meeting we're partaking in, the lead-in photographs show a tremendous load of ice on top of pots on the deck of a vessel. And that's not the way this calculation is done. This is done on horizontal and vertical surfaces. And there's a whole lot of other things going on on that boat and inside of a pot.

2.5

And I and Bud and Jonathan have all looked, I think, since we first talked about this several months ago at a pot -- and like I said, I sent you photographs of a pot that was literally solid ice. And I made a sample, as bad as it is, calculation of a pot and the amount of wires and the amount of pipes in that pot, and I easily, easily came up with additional 300-plus pounds of weight to that pot formed by ice, which far exceeds if you were just doing the shoebox approach to that pot.

And subsequently -- maybe I'm way ahead of your interview here, but subsequently, you can't do a calculation and say that the boat rolled over or didn't roll over from ice. But if you start adding 3- or 400 pounds of ice to every pot on that vessel -- and I don't remember how many were on this vessel; it was a bunch -- I wouldn't be surprised if you were to run that GHS calculation and put that additional 3-, 400 pounds in there for every pot, this vessel might well have roll over.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Lieutenant McPhillips, can you please pull up Exhibit 93 please, page 1? So this is not the *Scandies Rose*,

gentlemen, but this is a photo that we were provided aboard a crab vessel showing -- demonstrating some of the icing conditions. So looking at this photo, gentlemen, does this represent the standards outlined in the current regulations?

MR. ZANKICH: Speak up, Jonathan.

MR. PARROTT: Well, I mean, it looks like this is just surface ice on those pots or whatever structure that is, and that, in itself, would probably be pretty close to what the regulations show. What the issue is is with crab pots is that they can accumulate ice on the inside of the pots, and if you've got wind and weather coming from a certain direction, the pots on that side are going to be heavier, are going to accumulate ice -- more ice in it than pots on the other side.

I just pulled up a picture of a boat that has icing in it, it's a house aft crabber, and apparently -- I would say the weather's coming in from the port bow side, because forward, the pots are just -- I mean, you can't see the pots because of the ice, but aft of the crane, you can see the ice. There's some ice accumulation on pots, but it's less as it goes further aft, so I -- you know, calculating icing on pots is going to be very difficult, because it's such a random event, and the effects are so dependent on vessel heading and a number of factors. It's, it's, it's difficult.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Lieutenant McPhillips, can you pull up Exhibit 46 please? This is the Marine Safety Alert regarding

stability. So, looking at this, is this more what's referred to as the blocks of ice in the -- in that picture on the first page there?

2.5

MR. PARROTT: That's exactly -- I'm looking at a partial view of that exact same picture. You can see that, aft of the crane, the pots have less accumulation of ice than that -- I mean, it's just one block of ice forward. But that is the picture that I was looking at on the internet.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you. And so, Lieutenant McPhillips, if you can zoom out. I just want to gauge, so are you -- have you gentlemen all seen this document before?

MR. ZANKICH: I think I got a copy of this from a lawyer in Alaska, and I think I forwarded it on to your committee, because I think this is the one that takes reference to the fact that you could tarp the pots. But maybe it isn't. Maybe it's another one of these.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. And you bring up the issue of tarping the pots. So, in your professional opinions, would tarping the pots add benefit? And if so, can you talk to that? And if not, what would be the hazards of that?

MR. ZANKICH: Well, it's a maybe or maybe not. You can tarp the pots and then you can calculate per that IMO or Coast Guard rule about so many inches of ice. You can still get more ice than that, however, but at least you're not dealing with the interior of the pots being iced and iced and iced. But how do you

-- and I know my customers, maybe the others, would be, wow, how are we ever going to tarp the pile of pots?

2.5

And I guess you'd have to do that when you leave port, so you could tarp them in port and only cover -- under -- uncover particular areas, and then, as you restack parts -- pots, you'd have to start tarping over those pots also. Fortunately, pots have lots of areas where you can put hooks to hold tarps. But the -- but that ice accumulation in that picture that's on the screen here is, like I say, an accident looking for a place to happen.

MR. BRONSON: This is Mr. Bronson. If I could add a couple of comments. First, the idea of tarping all of these is an interesting phenomenon, but I deal, and have for years, done ocean racing with large sailboats. Handling a 2,000-square-foot piece of canvas in a wind with ice and all that in addition, I think that's a disaster that's even worse than the problem with the pipe — with the, with the ice. I can see crew getting thrown overboard trying to, trying to control that. We're not talking about doing this under nice conditions but in terrible conditions, and to have a 40-by-40 piece of canvas running around is not something I would like to do.

MR. ZANKICH: Unless you were to do it, Bud, before you left port and then take it off if you don't have icing conditions coming up.

MR. BRONSON: Okay. But, eventually, you're going to have to take that tarp off.

1 MR. ZANKICH: Yeah.

MR. PARROTT: And you're not going to take it off in port; you're going to take it off at sea. And you've got to have fairly calm conditions, and that is not the North Pacific.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. And referring back to that Marine Safety Alert following the casualty on the fishing vessel Destination just a few years back, have any of you or your companies shifted any of the work that you do in regards to stability on crab vessels, vessels of similar design since that casualty or since any of these alerts have come out?

MR. BRONSON: I haven't done any crabbers in the last five to eight years.

MR. ZANKICH: We haven't modified our standards or the way we treat things in quite a few years, and not since -- definitely not since the *Scandies Rose*. We were awaiting the guardians of the coast -- I'm sorry, the Coast Guard to tell us what went on. Fortunately, in this case, they had a couple of survivors, so maybe we know, maybe, what went on. But we were waiting before we made modifications for here.

MR. PARROTT: One of the things that's happened to our calculations in the last 12 to 18 months is that ABS has now required us to add in the icing of the forward superstructure to the calculations, in addition to the side profile and the horizontal areas. So that, that's the only change that I'm aware of in the last two years on stability calculations.

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. And, when you refer to the forward portion of the superstructure, are you -- the bow section and astern, astern house vessel? Is that what you're referring to?

MR. PARROTT: That would be like the front of the superstructure of the aft part of the vessel.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. And so kind of thinking over the -some of the pictures we just looked at with regards to icing, and
while the last two were pretty extreme, some of you had mentioned
some experience on vessels out in that area. What are the -- you
know, what would be some normal icing conditions as far as ice
accumulation that would be assumed as fairly normal conditions
while underway?

MR. ZANKICH: I surely can't say because I've only been out to Dutch Harbor half a dozen times, and I wasn't aboard a boat. I was there to do tests on boats. I should note, even at this port, in 1977, Dr. Storch of the University of Washington wrote a (indiscernible) paper about Alaska king crab boat casualties. He reviewed 300 vessels, and he said were -- a significant number were built from '67 to '74, and they had 107 casualties. And in this paper, which is quite a few pages, only one or two mentions of ice or even icing are listed in the 13 cases that he "detaily" covered. You should read that paper. I don't know what happened from '67 to '74 or in '77 when he wrote this paper. Maybe global warming came along, and we started having a lot more icing, but we didn't have any icings back then. I don't know why.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you. I'm going to shift a little away from the ice and talk -- go back to something you mentioned earlier with regards to pot weight and determining the number of 3 pots that the vessel can carry. So, as naval architects, how do you account for the weight of pots and the gear in your stability 6 calculations?

MR. ZANKICH: We ask the owner what size pot he's got, how many fathoms of line he's got in there, how many buoys that he stores in there. And we'll even ask him to go and weigh one like the Coast Guard asks.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And how important is it that those pots and gear are correct in terms of the weight that they provide you?

MR. PARROTT: Well, they're very important.

MR. ZANKICH: Very important.

1

2

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

Yeah. The -- I mean, you need to get as MR. PARROTT: accurate information, weights and dimensions so that, you know, that you can put the realistic loads on the boat and run it through the stability conditions to make sure the conditions meet the criteria.

MR. BRONSON: All of this weight is above the center of gravity. It's just decreasing transverse stability. It's vital.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And so, once they -- once you have pot weights, in moving forward to create that -- the stability instructions, how do you determine, then, how many of the pots can be carried?

1 MR. BRONSON: Well, I -- when I have done that, I have done a 2 little sketch that laid out where on the vessel the pots were going to be, whether they were going to be stacked vertically or, 3 you know, horizontally, but generally, the bottom stack is all 4 5 verticals and then you lay horizontal layers on top. You do a 6 weight moment study of the pots and how that affects the center of 7 gravity and then run your transverse stability calculations and see if that meets the energy needs. 8

MR. ZANKICH: And you consult with the owner. He's got to tell you what he's planning on doing.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And so, once you've calculated the number of pots and indicated that, can a vessel carry items on top of the stack of pots? And, if so, how would you account for that weight ensuring the vessel was stable beyond that?

(Simultaneous speaking.)

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

MR. ZANKICH: Only if he asked for something up there would we have it in the, in the calculation.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: So interpreting that, then it would be something that would have to be included in the initial calculations ahead of time?

MR. BRONSON: Yes, yeah.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Gentlemen, we have been going for an hour and -- almost an hour and 15 minutes now. Would you gentlemen like to take a short recess at this point, or are you good to go -- keep going for a little bit?

MR. ZANKICH: I'd like to go pump the bilge for a minute.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Let's go ahead and take a five-minute recess. The time is 0943. We will resume at 0948.

(Off the record at 9:43 a.m.)

(On the record at 9:49 a.m.)

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. It's 0949. The hearing is back in session.

Welcome back, gentlemen. Just want to kind of go back -- Lieutenant McPhillips, can you please just pull up Exhibit 014 please, page 1, just to have for referencing the configuration of the *Scandies Rose*?

So, gentlemen, in kind of -- in taking a look at the profile of the vessel and also looking at -- going back to our discussion on icing, we're trying to get an understanding of the effects an icing will have on a vessel with a pot configuration of this sort and if -- I guess my, my general question is, as the vessel's proceeding and making headway and starts to take on freezing spray, is there a point where the ice accumulation on the pots could then essentially serve in a function where it shifts, shifts the stability to a degree where -- that, that isn't -- is not recoverable?

MR. BRONSON: So I think the simple answer is yes. If you look at where those pots are with them empty right now, there's a lot of air above the main deck. If you start putting ice in there, the center of gravity is continually rising. Eventually,

you're going to raise it high enough above to where the vessel may roll over.

2.5

MR. PARROTT: That would especially be exaggerated if the, the ice is accumulating on one side more than the other instead of a uniform accumulation of ice about --

MR. ZANKICH: That's why I mentioned earlier that the master may want, may want to put his nose into it to, to try and go that way if he can to keep himself from getting a list.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. And, and if they go from -- if they were going from a condition where they had been previously receiving freezing spray, taking wind off -- wind and swells off one side, and over time -- and so, take, you know, heeling -- taking into account the wind heel from the direction of the wind and then starting to take on freezing spray on the same side, could that -- where would you expect the, the ice accumulation to start?

MR. BRONSON: When you look at the track of the *Scandies Rose* once she came out of -- on, on the north end of Kodiak Island and turned, she was going southwest and the winds were from the northwest. To me, it's perfectly reasonable to expect that most of the ice will be on the starboard side. And, at some point, you build enough up, you'll roll over, which is apparently what happened in this case.

MR. ZANKICH: Looking at this profile of the boat, on the foredeck, there's a break water or a wave breaker or whatever it

is. There'll be a massive accumulation of ice up there very quickly on that foredeck, and then the -- it'll progress into the pots.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And so --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

2.5

MR. ZANKICH: -- nose into the wind.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And just two questions then there, so in that case, if she's got some wind heel with -- taking ice accumulation from the, from the prevailing winds, then would there be a point where the accumulation could then shift enough to where it shifts the stability from one side to the other?

MR. ZANKICH: I don't understand the question.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: For example, if she had a port list and started taking freezing spray from the starboard side, would there be a point where ice accumulation would shift -- would be enough to shift, shift the list of the vessel over to starboard?

MR. ZANKICH: I presume so.

MR. BRONSON: Probably, yes.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And then my second question, looking at the profile of the vessel here, as you mentioned, the ice may accumulate in different fashions along the profile of the vessel. From the vantage point of the pilothouse, do you -- does the -- do you think the person at -- in the pilothouse has the -- an accurate reflection of what that accumulation is beyond the stack of pots?

MR. ZANKICH: Well, your question was about ice. But I look at this profile, and that pile of pots is too high for the captain of that vessel to see two boat-lengths ahead of his vessel in the water. He can't see. So all he can see is an icebox in front of him, and he can't see what's going on up there. So as far as icing, you know, he can see it happening from his wheelhouse, but he can't see up in the front. There's a couple guys standing on the bow of this thing, but they're not going to be standing there if they're icing. They're running for cover. And so he can't see what's going on on the front of that pile of pots. And he can't see over that pile of pots is what I mentioned also.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And, earlier on, one of you gentlemen had mentioned one of the limiting factors in the number of pots, particularly on vessels of this design, pertains a lot to -- with the visibility from the pilothouse. Based on your professional experience, looking at this profile, what would your assessment be in the number of pots and, and the -- bridge visibility aboard the Scandies Rose at this time?

MR. ZANKICH: It's too damn many.

MR. BRONSON: It looks like that top whole layer should come off, in my opinion, for him to be able to see forward.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Gentlemen, at this time -- because I think there's a lot of great questions, and this discussion has been very informative, but I -- what I would like to do at this point is I'd like to shift questions -- I know my colleague from

the National Transportation Safety Board has some questions for you, so I'd like to pass it over to Mr. Barnum from the National Transportation Safety Board at this time.

Mr. Barnum?

2.5

MR. BARNUM: Thank you, Captain.

And thank you, gentlemen. A lot of great, great information here, very insightful. I appreciate it. I know I'm learning a lot. I'm sure the public is as well. Kind of -- I'm going to kind of skip around. The Captain covered a lot. I do have a few follow-ups.

First off, I wanted to bring up, let's see, Exhibit -- the regulations and talk about the regulations governing again -- 40 -- 40 please. And if we can go to page 45. Okay. So here, here discusses -- this is Title 46 C.F.R. 28 Subpart E Section 28 here, paragraph 530. So in you -- in your understanding, are these the regulations that the *Scandies Rose* would have -- would fall under for their stability?

MR. BRONSON: I believe so.

MR. PARROTT: Yes.

MR. BARNUM: Okay. I just --

MR. ZANKICH: Yes, but Subchapter 28 didn't come out, maybe, when the boat was built.

MR. BARNUM: Understood.

MR. ZANKICH: We naval architects kind of were alone out here for years writing our own standards, like using Rahola or, or

other standards to make instructions for boats. And we did not have -- and I don't think *Scandies Rose* had this in her previous (indiscernible) book.

MR. BARNUM: Okay. A vessel having a major modification, though, I believe would have to fall under these stability rules?

MR. ZANKICH: Yeah.

MR. PARROTT: That would be yes.

MR. BARNUM: Yeah. Okay. I just wanted to read a part of this and get your feedback on it. So mid-way down this first paragraph says, "The rules provide maximum flexibility for owners and qualified individuals to determine how this information is conveyed, taking into consideration decisions by operating personnel must be made quickly and that few operating personnel in the commercial fishing industry have been — have had specialized training in stability. Therefore, stability instructions should take into account the conditions a vessel may reasonably be expected to encounter and provide simple guidance to the operating personnel to deal with these situations."

So the stability instructions the three of you complete for these, these similar vessels, where would -- what kind of simple, specialized, you know, guidance that is mentioned here, where would that be included in your stability instructions?

MR. BRONSON: In my -- in the booklets that I would prepare, they would be in the -- in the instructions to the master.

MR. BARNUM: Okay.

MR. BRONSON: And, if it were the type of the vessel that
might have to go back and calculate another loading condition,
there might be a separate section of the stability book that
showed how to calculate another loading condition that's not part
of the booklet.

MR. BARNUM: Understood.

MR. ZANKICH: As an aside to that, nowadays, many -- I won't say all, but many fishing vessels have a computer in the pilothouse. And we, Columbia-Sentinel, probably Jensen, probably others, have been known to provide an Excel spreadsheet on that computer with all the tankages, and they put in how much percent is in every tank and the deck load or how many pots are on deck. We can do that now with an Excel spreadsheet, and we could even put on that Excel spreadsheet how many inches of ice they're expecting based upon the horizontal or vertical surfaces where they're seeing, and that could have a block down in the corner that says safe or unsafe.

MR. BARNUM: Okay. All right. So, in your opinions, would you consider a vessel operated in the Bering Sea, Aleutian Islands, such as the *Scandies Rose* crabbing vessel, would you consider icing accumulation to be one of the possible conditions that a -- that vessel could encounter?

MR. PARROTT: Definitely.

MR. BRONSON: Yes.

MR. ZANKICH: Yes, if the master said he was going north of

that latitude.

MR. BARNUM: Okay. And I, and I understand that the regulations factor in to margin for icing. That I want to discuss in a minute there. But would, would you feel that it might be important to include some sort of guidance on icing in those instructions to the master you — that you mentioned?

MR. PARROTT: Typically, when we issue our booklets, we have a description of hull icing. Gives -- basically says that it has so many inches on vertical surfaces, so many inches on horizontal surfaces, and equivalent weight. And we also put in there that icing can easily be in excess of, of these numbers.

MR. BARNUM: Okay. Great. Thank you. All right. I -MR. PARROTT: Typical of Paul's stuff too.

MR. BARNUM: Okay. Lieutenant McPhillips, could you please bring up Exhibit No. 36, page 5?

Gentlemen, this is the 2019 stability instructions for the Scandies Rose. Page 5 is the instructions to the master. I know you've already looked at this under Commander -- Captain Callaghan's line of questioning, but is there anything on here instructing the master or alerting the master to any icing -- special icing conditions?

MR. PARROTT: The only icing mentioned is in item two.

Basically, it gives -- it just says it applies for icing or

non-icing conditions. It doesn't really describe what an icing

condition is.

MR. PARROTT: All right. Mr. Parrott, would, would stability instructions issued by your firm contain a more detailed description?

MR. BARNUM: Yes, it would.

MR. BARNUM: Okay.

MR. PARROTT: It would, it would give the -- as I said, it would say, say that there's approximately so many inches of ice on the vertical surface, so many inches of ice on a horizontal surface, and it's equivalent of so many pounds of added weight in ice.

MR. BARNUM: Okay. Thank you. And going to back to the exhibit for regulation -- sorry, Lieutenant McPhillips, for jumping around some, but could you bring that one back up? That's Exhibit 40.

And I wanted to just get your professional explanation of the Section 550 on icing. We've been talking a lot about accumulation of icing on these vessels. Could one of you just, you know, explain to us the amount of icing that regulation — the amount of icing that the regulations account for onboard these vessels that operate in this area?

MR. ZANKICH: Yeah, it's pretty clear, item 28.550 --

MR. BARNUM: Yeah.

MR. ZANKICH: -- (a), (b) -- I guess it's (b)(1) says 1.3 inches on horizontal. I guess I can't read the next one down. Oh, there it is.

MR. PARROTT: 0.65 inches of, you know, vertical.

MR. ZANKICH: 0.65 inches on vertical.

MR. BARNUM: Okay. And Commander -- Captain Callaghan mentioned it earlier, this is a boat full of crab pots, a stack of pots. This would be -- you know, how would you apply these numbers to a stack of pots given this guidance from the regulations?

MR. BRONSON: That exact --

MR. BARNUM: How would you treat it?

MR. BRONSON: You, you have a -- I, I would have a diagram or a drawing of the vessel that showed where I was going to put pots, and I would calculate the surface area that's vertical and that's horizontal and apply those numbers on there and, using a weight moment calculation, see what that did to the center of gravity

MR. ZANKICH: That's the shoebox method, right?

MR. BRONSON: Yes.

2.5

MR. BARNUM: Okay.

MR. BRONSON: And, and therein lies the challenge is that this presumes that that box — that shoebox of crab pots is a shoebox. It's not a shoebox. It does not have a horizontal and a vertical surface. It has a bunch of pots in there that are just screens. As the water comes over the top, it's not going to lay on the top layer of the top on a bunch of pots. It's going to slowly filter down through all of them. And, and there's the challenge that we have is we don't have any good information on

how that happens.

2.5

MR. BARNUM: Right.

MR. ZANKICH: Now both Bud and I and Jonathan, I think, in a subsequent -- or in a meeting we had, telephone call, the subject came up of this, and I think we all suggested that the Coast Guard should contract with a university or a wind tunnel or the Navy or somebody to take a crab pot or a bunch of them and put them in a wind tunnel with wind and put them with spray and see what really happens to a pot.

Although, we can tell you what's going to happen. We've got photographs of pots that are nothing but ice. But to see how quickly it can accumulate in a -- pick a number, a 40-knot wind at 15 degrees out. And if we had some of this data, maybe the Coast Guard could revamp their IMO standards here, which are clearly not real life in the North Pacific.

MR. BARNUM: Understood. Have, have any of you heard of any kind of studies that have taken -- that have gone on, you know, previously in trying to address that same -- figure out that same issue?

MR. ZANKICH: Not I.

MR. PARROTT: There are a couple of studies from way back in the '70s that were, I believe, NOAA studies about the icing in the, in the Pacific Northwest and icing during spray. I'm not sure -- I came across them when I was cleaning up the -- oh, here we go. They were -- I found -- cleaning up the office, I found

three different studies: icing of ship, splashing a ship with spray. It was done by the Pacific Marine Environmental Lab NOAA in 1986. They did another study, vessel icing in Alaskan waters, 1979 to 1984. It's a dataset that was published in 1985. then there was another article -- or a paper, prediction of vessel icing, that's a reprint from the Journal of Climate and Applied Meteorology in December of 1986. None of those, I suspect, specifically address pots. They're more on vessel, vessels themselves.

MR. BARNUM: Understood. Great. Thank you.

2.5

MR. BRONSON: The, the U.S. Navy has a publication on -talks about icing of vessels, and the challenge is that they're
all solid surfaces. They're not -- there's -- no one has ever
really looked at the crab pot problem.

MR. BARNUM: Understood. One, one follow-on question, my last question here to you Mr. Bronson. You had mentioned earlier you had taught some stability classes. Could you elaborate on that some please?

MR. BRONSON: We lost two boats back in the late '80s. Two boats were lost up in Alaska, and the North Pacific Fishing Vessel Owners Association was established, started doing a lot of things to try and address some of the education of crews. They did some exquisite medical training and all like that. One of the things that we did was, four or five years, we -- and they may still be teaching it; I just don't do it now. For five years, I taught a

one-week course on ship stability. We took a typical Northwest fishing vessel -- I don't recall whether it was a crabber or which particular type it was, but we took a vessel, an actual vessel that I had done some stability work on and we used that and we showed them how to calculate different loading conditions.

And we talked about icing, but the challenge even then was we really didn't -- we don't -- we really don't and didn't have any good information on how a crab pot ices, so we used the IMO criteria, which says, use the outside of the crab pot. And a crab pot isn't really a box. It's this sieve that collects ice all through it.

MR. BARNUM: Understood. Great. Thank you, gentlemen. I really appreciate it.

Captain, I'm all set.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Mr. Barnum.

Gentlemen, I'm now going to ask the PII if they have some follow-on questions for you, so I'll turn to PII -- counsel representing the two survivors.

Mr. Stacey, do you have any questions, sir?

MR. N. STACEY: Good morning, gentlemen. Thank you very much for your testimony and your work. We have no questions.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Mr. Stacey.

Now turn it over to counsel representing the vessel owners, Mattsen Management Company.

MR. BARCOTT: Thank you, Captain.

LO

Gentlemen, thank you. My name under my screen says Daniel Barcott. This is Mike Barcott. I'm using Daniel's computer for -- technical issues arose.

I know the Board, of course, knows this, but the general public may not. Could you explain how it is the three of you came to be providing testimony to this Court?

MR. ZANKICH: This is Paul Zankich. I recall getting a call from Bud, and Bud said, are you aware the Coast Guard's going to -- scheduling a -- or is doing an investigation. And I said, no, but they ought to. And I went to my computer, and I clicked on Coast Guard Investigation Scandies Rose, and Mr. Callaghan's name, as I recall, came up. And I called San Francisco and said I wanted to talk to him, and I did. And he referred me to one of the people that was working on this situation.

And I called Bud back and said, Bud, she -- I think it was a she -- wants to know if you're interested in talking to them. And he said yes. Then I called Jonathan and said, I could get you in trouble really quickly. Would you, would you like to talk to the Coast Guard on this subject, also, with Bud and I? And he, voluntarily, said, yes, I'm very interested. And we called back to whoever that was and set up a phone call.

MR. BARCOTT: So if, if I characterize it as you are three interested citizens with specialized knowledge who are volunteering your expertise to the industry, is that a fair assessment of what you're doing?

MR. ZANKICH: Well, it -- let me make a statement here. you're a crabber, you have to believe the Coast Guard standards. You have to believe the IMO standards. You have to believe your naval architect. All of these three beliefs need review in this inquiry because we are the naval architects who are asking our owners and operators to believe, and we rely upon the Coast Guard standard to believe and the IMO standard to believe. And honestly, I don't believe those standards now.

MR. BARCOTT: Mr. Parrott or Mr. Bronson, care to comment on that?

2.5

MR. BRONSON: I think he reasonably describes our problem. We understand how the IMO came up with the, the standards they have for icing, but the crab fishery in the Northwest Pacific is significantly different than anywhere else. I've, I've done work everywhere from Northern Europe, China; I'm doing work now down in New Zealand. This fishery is different than all of the others in that we have this lovely device called a crab pot, which we all love because we love Alaska king crab and all that jazz. But it doesn't behave the way we're told we should apply this — the rules.

At least from my own point of view, I've had a master's license, I've sailed, I've been up there, I've done tuna fishing. I want those guys to come back -- and with apologies to the ladies, I want those guys and gals to come back. I want the stuff that I -- the work that I do, I want them to give them a chance to

come back alive. And, with the king crab pots right now, I don't want to restrict them if I don't have to, but I sure would like to make sure that the information I'm giving them is the best chance to come back alive.

MR. BARCOTT: Yeah, I'm sure we all.

Mr. Parrott?

MR. PARROTT: Well, I mean, we're talking about king crab pots, but, I mean, pot fishing is expanding into other fisheries. It's -- lingcod fishing, they use pots now because apparently the orcas have gotten smart enough to know that long lines is a buffet for them. So the -- pot fishing is going to expand and there are going to be more people doing it. People -- you know, crab fishermen have been doing it for years. They're familiar with -- generally familiar with how pots affect the stability of their boats. Some of these new fisherman may not have that. So, you know, we need to be aware of the, the pitfalls of new crew coming into the -- into this -- this pot fishery.

MR. BARCOTT: So the members of the Board, of course, understand the next area I'm going to go into, and I understand that area, but I'm not sure the public does, and your testimony has been helpful. But I'd like to make it crystal clear, when a stability study for a vessel like the *Scandies Rose* is done, according to the current regulations, does it assume that ice accumulates on the outside areas of the pots only?

MR. PARROTT: Correct.

1 MR. BARCOTT: I'll stop there. Let me stop there. 2 one of the assumptions? 3 That is correct. MR. PARROTT: Okav. And does it assume that that ice will 4 MR. BARCOTT: accumulate on vertical surfaces to six-tenths of an inch? 5 Yeah, it's 0.6 or 0.65 or some number. 6 MR. ZANKICH: 7 Right. And the horizontal surfaces, the top of MR. BARCOTT: the crab stack, does it assume that ice will accumulate on the top 8 9 only and how much ice? It's 33 millimeters. 10 MR. PARROTT: Inch to about an inch and a half. MR. BRONSON: 11 12 MR. PARROTT: Inch, to an inch and a half. 13 Something less than that. MR. BRONSON: 14 MR. BARCOTT: And you've talked about a shoebox, and the 15 concept of a shoebox has been used, but again, I want to make sure 16 this is really understandable. If you put a giant shoebox over the stack of crab pots and accumulated ice on that shoebox, 17 six-tenths of an inch on the vertical surfaces and 1.3 inches or 18 so on the horizontal surfaces, is that what the regulations tell 19 20 you to do in calculating icing? That's the guidance it provides, yes. 21 MR. PARROTT: 22 Okay. And does -- do the regulations also MR. BARCOTT: 23 assume that that ice will accumulate uniformly over those

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

It does.

24

25

surfaces?

MR. PARROTT:

1 MR. BARCOTT: Okay.

2.5

MR. BRONSON: On the average, I would say.

MR. BARCOTT: Right. But there is no accounting in the regulations for uneven distribution of ice, as I understand it; is that right?

MR. ZANKICH: That's true.

MR. BARCOTT: Okay. So, in the regulations, is there any consideration given for the water that drips down into the middle of that crab pot stack and ice accumulates?

MR. ZANKICH: No.

MR. BRONSON: There isn't, not to my understanding.

MR. BARCOTT: Okay. So I'd like an answer to this question from each of you, if you would. The regulations that dictate how stability studies are to be performed in icing conditions, how do those match the reality of crab fishing in the North Pacific?

MR. BRONSON: Well, that's my question is I, I don't believe it's accurate, and I want to know what the -- how do we really apply something in that area? What, what really happens?

MR. BARCOTT: Mr. Zankich, reality versus regulations, how do they match up?

MR. ZANKICH: Well, I, as a naval architect, don't believe the regulation.

MR. BARCOTT: Mr. Parrott?

MR. PARROTT: I believe the, the regulations provide minimal guidance in the application of ice. I don't think the -- I know

that there are situations where the boats will be out, and they will accumulate much more ice than the regulations provide guidance for.

MR. BARCOTT: Okay. And I understand from what you said,
Mr. Parrott, earlier that you may actually provide information
when Jensen does stability studies that, that accounts for
additional accumulation of ice beyond what the regulations call
for; is that right?

MR. PARROTT: Well, what we do is we indicate in our stability letters that the regulations -- the guidance there is a certain accumulation of ice on, on the shoebox and that -- we usually have a final statement in there that, that accumulation of ice will -- can be in excess of this guidance and that the master should take that into account.

MR. BARCOTT: Okay. But since Mr. Bronson has pointed out there are no good studies on exactly how much additional ice accumulates, do you have good quantitative data to provide to your captains as they consider additional icing?

MR. ZANKICH: No.

2.5

MR. PARROTT: No, we do not.

MR. BARCOTT: Okay. Mr. Bronson or Mr. Zankich, did you want to comment on that additional information to the operator?

MR. ZANKICH: Not as we presently address it, but I've seen -- there are methods out there now with Excel spreadsheets and such. We could possibly do that, but they would probably also

assume the shoebox until we hear more about the mesh (ph.) box. 1 2 MR. BARCOTT: Right. 3 MR. ZANKICH: So we would gain maybe a little with, with the spreadsheet telling them, if you got two times this ice, are you 4 5 safe or unsafe, or you got three times this ice, are you safe and unsafe. But that doesn't account for the mesh box. 6 7 MR. BARCOTT: Right. Gentlemen, I really appreciate you coming forward. This is very helpful. Thank you. 8 9 Those are all the questions I have, Captain. 10 CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Mr. Barcott. So, gentlemen, I am -- would like to answer a few questions 11 and, and ask a few more. But before I do so, I do -- I would like 12 to take a two-minute recess just to discuss an item with the 13 14 parties in interest on a photo I'd like to bring up that we have 15 not previously provided as an exhibit. So I'm going to take a --16 it's 1026. I'm going to take a two-minute recess, and we'll reconvene in two minutes. Thank you. 17 (Off the record at 10:26 a.m.) 18 (On the record at 10:27 a.m.) 19 20 CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. It's now 1027, and we're back in session. 21

Thank you, gentlemen. I appreciate your, your patience there. A bunch of us talked an item over with the parties in interest.

22

23

24

25

Lieutenant Commander Comerford, would you mind pulling up

that photo we just talked about?

2.5

So, gentlemen, as kind of alluded to earlier, with regards to studies that have been conducted and, you know, the timeframe that it's been since such studies have, have been conducted.

So just to make the public aware, as, as part of this Marine Board, we've done a couple of things to try and push those efforts forward. Number one is we've tried to engage the Coast Guard Research and Development Center to take on a longer-term study for ice secretion on crab pots. But in the -- in immediate interest of the hearing and gaining some elementary data on ice accumulation, a single pot was put aboard the Coast Guard cutter Polar Star on her last voyage up through the Arctic. And so this is a picture of the, the pot as it was onboard, empty, with a pot weight that they estimated was close to 1,000 pounds prior to conducting the experiment.

And so, gentlemen, before I show you the next picture, just would like to ask, so in your professional -- your professional experience, how much weight do you think a pot could accumulate with ice alone?

MR. ZANKICH: My rough calculations have said 300 pounds.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay.

MR. ZANKICH: Bud can give a calculation also.

MR. PARROTT: Basically, I would assume that the maximum weight would be that full pot full of ice. So eight-by-eight-by-three, ice at 64 pounds per cubic foot, plus the, the pot weight.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Lieutenant Commander Comerford, can you switch to the next picture?

2.5

So this is a -- after 72 hours of conducting the experiment with utilizing a fresh water hose -- so not exactly the same representation, but again, this was to measure accumulation. So, gentlemen, just to ask you, you know, what, what do you -- looking at this picture, what do you see as far as accumulation on the, the top of the pot and then the sides of the pots?

MR. PARROTT: Nothing on the sides, but the tops looks to be about three inches. But it's interesting to see the icicles hanging inside the pot, so --

MR. ZANKICH: And can you imagine if this was alongside another pot or underneath another pot? Wow. I'm a --

MR. PARROTT: Well, the, the thing with a pot stack though is they'll -- as the pots freeze, there'll be less and less water reaching the interior of the lower pots. So the, the weight of the ice is going to accumulate higher quicker. And, and you may have pots down on the bottom of the tier that have no ice at all in them.

MR. ZANKICH: I don't believe that.

MR. PARROTT: Well, that's good, but --

MR. ZANKICH: It runs downhill.

MR. PARROTT: Yeah, but it -- as it runs downhill, it freezes, and then it, it provides obstructions, so the water coming down will freeze earlier and -- you know, it's -- I've seen

this happen on, on brush.

2.5

MR. ZANKICH: Well, what's the punchline? How many pounds was that?

CAPT CALLAGHAN: So, at the end of the experiment, unfortunately, we were not able to get a total weight, and only because the pot maxed out our 3,000-pound scale.

MR. ZANKICH: So you're saying there's more, more than 2,000 pounds in this pot?

CAPT CALLAGHAN: That -- from the -- an initial weight of 1,000 pounds --

MR. ZANKICH: Wow.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: -- prior -- pre-test to maxing out the, the -- the scale at, at the end of the test.

MR. ZANKICH: That is astounding. But I guess that's real life. That's what we were asking for was get some data. That'll tip a boat over really quickly.

CDR DENNY: (Indiscernible).

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Mr. Bronson, I believe you're on mute, sir.

MR. BRONSON: Okay. Now can you, now can you hear me?

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Yes, sir.

MR. BRONSON: I, I have two or three acquaintances who are not quite my age, but they've been up there, and we were talking, and they all said that the lower levels of pots have more ice than the upper ones because the, the water trickles down and begins to freeze on the lower pots first and works its way slowly up. I --

that's an unskilled seaman's eye of what happened. That's why I really want somebody to do a study. I want somebody who can, who can come back to us and tell us what really happens.

MR. ZANKICH: This was a good start though.

MR. BRONSON: Oh, yes. Yeah.

MR. ZANKICH: If you had it stacked up -- a stack of four or five of them high.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Thank you, Lieutenant Commander Comerford.

Okay. So I'm going to ask my Coast Guard colleagues here if they've got any follow-on questions for you gentlemen.

LCDR COMERFORD: Thank you, Captain.

I'd like to start by going back to Exhibit 040, page 42, the stability instructions section. Oh, page 45 I think. Thank you, Lieutenant McPhillips. Can you scroll down to paragraph (e)(1)? Okay. No, back up please. All right.

Gentlemen, (e) (1) talks about the stability instructions, including the light weight data. First question, generally from your opinion, is this important? Is this essential information for the stability instructions?

MR. ZANKICH: I don't usually put that on the initial sheet. I bury it back in the stability calculations of the book. You could see where the light weight of the vessel is for every condition, and it should be the same starting point for every condition.

MR. PARROTT: Typically on ABS load line in class, their instructions will include light weight data. It's not -- it's important for the naval architect to know what it is. For the master of the vessel, other than knowing that any change to that data will be critical to the stability of the vessel, actually knowing the actual weight in centers is probably not that critical.

LCDR COMERFORD: Okay.

MR. ZANKICH: That's why we put it in the booklet area.

MR. BRONSON: Well, my only comment is that, if you're going to do other loading conditions, you have to have the light weight data. You have to know what the light ship value is and the center of gravity, because that's part of the calculation, to come up with the current -- the, the center of gravity right now, which is what you're going to use to determine whether you've got a stable or unstable condition.

LCDR COMERFORD: Lieutenant McPhillips, can you turn to Exhibit 36, page 4 first? That's back to the stability instruction from 2019 for *Scandies Rose*.

Generally first, broad question before I go into this, if you were to do an updated stability instruction, would you find it best practice or a requirement to follow the required stability instructions and that Subpart of 28 -- 46 C.F.R. 28?

MR. ZANKICH: (Indiscernible) the question.

LCDR COMERFORD: So earlier -- let me clarify. Earlier,

there was a comment, the vessel's very old; it may not have been built when the regulations were in place. And then my follow-up question to that would be, if this was done in 2019, would you, would you find it prudent or is it a requirement to meet those requirements in that paragraph of the C.F.R.?

MR. PARROTT: I think --

2.5

MR. ZANKICH: I, Paul Zankich, would have assumed I had it in there because I had it in there on every condition description.

MR. BRONSON: I agree with Mr. Zankich.

LCDR COMERFORD: On this page, do you see any characteristics that would indicate the, the light ship of the vessel?

MR. BRONSON: Not on this page, but that's not where I would expect to see it. I would expect to see it on a worksheet that lets you do a load calculation.

LCDR COMERFORD: All right. Lieutenant McPhillips, can we just go to the next page?

And, again, I'm going to ask the same question. Did, did you see it in the instructions to the master?

MR. PARROTT: No.

MR. BRONSON: Nor would I expect to see it there.

LCDR COMERFORD: And then --

MR. ZANKICH: Nor would I expect to see it there.

LCDR COMERFORD: And -- understood. And can we -- Lieutenant McPhillips, can you progress on to the first condition? Can you keep, can you keep scrolling down? All right.

Can you, can you help me find the -- to the gentlemen of the panel, can you help me find the light ship information or where I should -- should I be looking further in the instructions?

MR. ZANKICH: This sheet does not have it. I -- I don't have the entire book in front of me, so I --

LCDR COMERFORD: Yeah, understood.

And one more, Mr. McPhillips, can we go to the next page?

Again, any indication of light ship on this page?

MR. PARROTT: None.

MR. ZANKICH: Nope.

LCDR COMERFORD: All right. Thank you. I, I don't want to go through every page of the book. I just wanted to get through some of the main pages. So thank you for that. Last question for me, can -- Lieutenant McPhillips, can you turn to Exhibit 004, page -- the first page. And focus on the, the picture of the vessel.

Again, this is a follow-up on some of the comments previously made. There appear to be some discussion, perhaps academic discussion on that side rail on the main deck. In the previous pictures you were shown, you saw a little bit of a higher side wall on the aft part of the main deck. Curious on your take on the balance between icing with this updated photo or the frame port concerns general, general — generally interested in hearing what your perspective is on this different photo of the vessel.

MR. ZANKICH: I don't see this would be any different icing

than the previous photo.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BRONSON: Are you saying that you think the bulwark has been raised?

MR. PARROTT: Yeah, the wing wall aft of the pot hauling station is higher on, on the more recent photos. That's very typical of the -- from the modifications in recent years to provide more weather protection for the deck crew.

LCDR COMERFORD: Now, to clarify, this is the most recent photo that we have of the *Scandies Rose*.

MR. ZANKICH: This is the most recent?

MR. PARROTT: No, the, the one with the pot --

MR. ZANKICH: And the previous one was not most recent?

LCDR COMERFORD: Correct.

MR. ZANKICH: Oh, now it's lower than it was then?

LCDR COMERFORD: It is lower than it was.

MR. PARROTT: Oh, interesting.

17 MR. ZANKICH: So it didn't go up, it went down?

18 LCDR COMERFORD: Yes.

MR. ZANKICH: Well, I mean, it might get a little more spray on that lower row of pots, but that'd be salt water spray rather than the rain coming in usually. And so that lower first pot might get a little more ice, but boats -- mostly, these boats aren't affected by the spray. It's the rain and the mist from the spray that's icing them up.

LCDR COMERFORD: Commander Denny, did you have any --

MR. BRONSON: Well, well, if --

LCDR COMERFORD: Those are --

2.5

MR. BRONSON: Well, if, if, if the latest stability study done by Mr. Culver is done after this picture was taken, then it would have calculated -- it would have taken care of the change in weight due to the lowering of this bulwark over there.

MR. PARROTT: That's correct.

CDR DENNY: And, gentlemen, this, this is Commander Denny.

I, I have a question that's a follow up to Lieutenant Commander

Comerford's but specifically in what you're talking about. In

your professional opinion, would that have been considered a major

modification or does that not meet that threshold?

MR. ZANKICH: Doesn't meet that threshold.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. BRONSON: That's not critical.

CDR DENNY: Okay.

MR. ZANKICH: That's a minor, minor housekeeping.

LCDR COMERFORD: What, what kind of things would you consider as a major conversion type of issue on these fishing vessels?

MR. ZANKICH: Lengthen, widen, add another deck.

MR. BRONSON: Build something underneath the waterline, adding a (indiscernible), something like that.

MR. PARROTT: Yeah, there's also vague reference to a chance in service. So like pulling a cargo vessel into a fishing industry would be a major conversion.

2.5

MR. BRONSON: Yes.

LCDR COMERFORD: Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Captain Callaghan, those are all the questions for me.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Lieutenant Commander Comerford.

And, gentlemen, now I'm going to pass it to Commander Karen Denny who's got a few follow-on questions.

CDR DENNY: Good morning, gentlemen. Thank you again. I want to shift the topics. I've been writing notes throughout our entire conversation. We've covered a lot of ground.

So, Mr. Bronson, my first follow up question is for you. Early on you mentioned that, that you had taught some stability courses to masters for a time. So a few follow-on questions to that. Could you refresh my memory of what that timeframe was please?

MR. BRONSON: My best recollection is somewhere around 1990 to 1995 probably, somewhere in that area, maybe a little earlier, maybe a little later. Certainly before the year 2000 because by that time I had moved and was chief engineer at Martinac Ship Building in Tacoma.

CDR DENNY: Okay. And, and you said that those were one-week courses. About how often a year did you put those on?

MR. BRONSON: Well, you can probably talk to the folks at NPFVOA, but I think probably at least three or four times a year.

CDR DENNY: And, and about how well attended were those? Did you have empty seats? Did you have -- roughly, to the best of

your recollection?

MR. BRONSON: I think there were probably maybe a dozen people at each one of those courses.

CDR DENNY: Okay. Do you happen to know how long that section -- if that's still being taught and if that training is still the same length of time that you, that you did them?

MR. BRONSON: I have no idea.

MR. PARROTT: I do know that NPFVOA is continuing stability instruction classes. I don't know duration or time. But I do know that they, they have a naval architect providing that quidance.

CDR DENNY: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. I appreciate that.

Mr. Parrott, you had made some comments about -- it was around the same section that we were talking about the GHS software, and you had mentioned that, through the course of things, you had found some bugs in the system, you relayed that information to the developers, and that they corrected those and those came out in the updates. Could you specify or elaborate what kind of bugs you, you found?

MR. PARROTT: I didn't find them. It would have been the people that were doing the, the calculations. Generally, they would be bugs that were in specific conditions where the program might not accurately call out -- it, it -- they have a graphic output and then data output, and sometimes the two might not

correspond. They might say that the, the angle of, of zero righting arm is at 40 degrees where it was actually at 38 or 42. So they were just minor corrections to some of, some of the calculations. And usually, once we verified that and got it back to GHS, they would send out a hot fix within a couple of days.

2.5

CDR DENNY: Okay. That is helpful. So -- but if you're not getting the general updates, does that still get sent out? Does it still connect with the computers, do you know?

MR. PARROTT: I don't know. That's one program we maintain a current subscription on because we base so much of our work on that. I, I do know that they just sent out an update earlier this year. I don't know how much it costs because I don't, I don't bother to take a look at those bills anymore. But they're, they're pretty good at updating and keeping, you know, putting more functions on the program.

CDR DENNY: Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

Jumping forward to later in the conversation, you guys mentioned that when we talked about the perceived inadequacies of the regulations, which I understand the concerns, how does that interrelate to your responsibilities as PEs? And, and I say you, but I mean the general PEs and nav arcs that do these calculations. As PEs, there -- I'm paraphrasing, but there's a general, like, a code of ethics where, you know, you're not to do harm to your clients, people, the environment. If, if you have concerns about the sufficiency of the regulations or the

calculations that are in place, what do you, as Pes, or your colleague in the PE community, do to mitigate that?

2.5

MR. ZANKICH: Do just what I did. Call Callaghan and tell him we're interested. We're on board. We want to get this straight.

CDR DENNY: That's fair, Mr. Zankich, but what about prior to the sinking of the *Scandies Rose* and, you know -- go ahead, sir.

MR. ZANKICH: Previous Coast Guard investigations haven't resulted or discovered things that affected the directions that the naval architecture was giving to the masters. But since this and since we had some survivors who could describe what went on, I'm pretty confident now those regulations are not -- I was assuming they were reasonably correct and had, had not reported or been reported to me by any operators that they had seen anything bogus in what we had told them. But I'm sure they could now.

MR. PARROTT: I think one of the, one of the factors in previous casualties of fishing vessels, it's been pretty apparent that weight gain or not operating in accordance with the stability instructions has been, has been the major factor of a casualty. I think this is one of the first vessel casualties that -- in recent years where the vessel has -- should have had adequate stability for the conditions that, that we typically look at.

MR. ZANKICH: I urge you to read that 19-, whatever it was, -77, Dr. Storch's paper about the casualties that he documented and he assigned various reasons for the casualty.

CDR DENNY: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Bronson, do you have any thoughts on that before I move on to another question?

MR. BRONSON: Well, one of the challenges we have as a -- as professionals is these regulations come out of IMO, the international organization. How do we decide -- how do I decide that, in this particular, case I will insist that I impose a more -- a more restrictive requirement on a vessel than what IMO, which is supposedly the international organization -- how do I, how do I, as a professional, override that? We've asked the question periodically and the answer has been, IMO has done their homework. Now we have a case in which we got to say, guys, would you please go back and do your homework again and verify it to us that what we're telling our clients is, is the right thing?

MR. ZANKICH: I (indiscernible) what you're suggesting. I've tried to tell a customer that I want to put an additional standard on in relation to like his crab tank and it's free surface. And some of them didn't even want to pay the bill for the naval architecture study at that point, because I was recommending 30 pots, and they could go down the street a couple blocks and get a 40-pot assignment on their vessel with that naval architect that wouldn't impose, impose that additional regulation that was not written down in the standards. And I lost customers by doing that. And I was, I was okay with that.

CDR DENNY: Thank you. Thank you, gentlemen. I appreciate

that.

2.5

Just a few minutes ago you mentioned, you know, additional weight gain, Mr. Parrott. Speaking of weight gain, have you, as a group of Pes, or do you know of organization -- PE organizations that are working with other sub-entities of the commercial fishing vessel industry to more accurately find out the weights of pots or develop standards to self-regulate within the community so that they can get either more accurate weights and therefore stability calculations, or are you aware of any initiatives like that?

MR. PARROTT: Well, I do know when Marty Kechow (ph.) and his crew were up at -- in -- up in Dutch Harbor. They instituted a -- the Coast Guard group up there instituted a policy of, of weighing pots for the crab fleet before they went out. We commonly, when we do a new stability report for crabbers, we ask that they update their weights for the crab pots they use. You know, they've, they've -- the crab pots have gone, you know, 600 pounds to 800 pounds because of heavier material being used, because they're fishing deeper or they're fishing in higher currents, so they need to -- need the pots to be heavier to, to stay in place.

I don't know if the Coast Guard is, is continuing that policy of weighing pots before each season on some of the boats -- I was pretty sure it was a random operation -- and then verifying that those weights were the weights that were included in the stability booklets for that particular vessel.

CDR DENNY: And you guys -- one PE, and I apologize that I

don't recall who, mentioned that, when stability tests are done, you might even actually ask a vessel operator or the representative of the vessel to weigh a pot right then and there so that you have accurate numbers. What you're referring to as the Coast Guard up in Alaska, they do weigh several pots at random off a vessel, and they note that, so -- but you brought up an interesting point about material and gear and how that changes. When you or your company do a stability report for a vessel, would that be something that triggers a different condition as -- for example, if they are fishing for one type of fishery, and that requires two shots of line and associated gear, and a different type of fishery, which requires some other type of gear which has a weight differential, do you run two different conditions? How does that work?

(Simultaneous speaking.)

2.5

MR. PARROTT: Yeah, we would --

MR. BRONSON: If I could just -- go ahead, Jonathan.

MR. PARROTT: No, you go ahead, Bud.

MR. BRONSON: I'm in the tuna fishing industry more than the others right now. Vessels that 30 years ago had a 2,000-fathom net that was 12 strips deep are now running 4,000 fathoms that are 22 strips deep. They're, they're — the same net is now two to three times the weight that it was before. You keep encouraging your clients, please tell me when you do things like this. And some of them do, and some of them don't. That's the challenge

that we have. We -- I know of at least one instance in which a tuna vessel pulled it masts down because the weights of the net and all had so -- gone up so much that they, they bent the mast off. That's part of the education problem that we have.

CDR DENNY: Thank you.

MR. PARROTT: And GHS is a very easy tool for the naval architect to be able to plug in different variables and run hundreds of conditions in an hour and, and check stability on, on those conditions. It's a wonderful tool for the naval architect.

CDR DENNY: Okay. Thank you, guys.

So, Lieutenant McPhillips, could you please pull up Exhibit 036, page 1? It's the stability -- the first page of the stability report. And just scroll down please. Actually -- yep, scroll down. One more. I have the page number incorrect, but I was going to the page -- oh, it's, it's -- actually, it's right there. That's perfect. Thank you. Thank you.

So I wanted to bring up this, this slide right here because one of the things that you mentioned is that when you -- after you go through the process -- or part of the process of establishing the, the stability conditions or the, the assumptions that you put in to the GHS, you indicated that you talked to the vessel master or the operator because there are very specific things that you want to know so that you can make it as accurate as possible for what they do.

So would you be concerned if you were not talking to the

vessel operator or somebody that has intimate knowledge on, let's say, how the loading condition is or the, the intimate details of the pot, the gear used on board? Would that be a concern, and what would you do as a PE if you were doing that?

MR. ZANKICH: I'm confused. What are you implying? What are you looking for?

CDR DENNY: I'm just trying to find out, as an experienced PE, if you have somebody that's not the operator -- because you were very specific in saying that you would talk to the vessel operator. I, I noted it a couple of times. So if you're talking to like the owner, who doesn't necessarily sail on the vessel, is that a concern for you as a PE? Do you then say, no, I need to have an interview with the operator so that I better understand that? How does that work?

MR. PARROTT: I guess it depends on how involved the owner is in the operation of the boat. If it's an owner who is -- you know, especially if they've run the boat before, they generally will brief their skippers on, on how best to operate it and, and the skippers may change a little bit. But typically we would prefer to, to interview with the actual skipper. But, then again, most boats have several skippers that --

MR. ZANKICH: Yeah, a couple.

MR. PARROTT: -- trade off and on.

MR. ZANKICH: A couple, yeah.

CDR DENNY: Okay. We can take that down. Thank you. I just

wasn't sure and I wanted to get clarification. So thanks for that.

Captain, I have no further questions at this time.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Commander Denny.

So I just want to go over and check with the colleagues at the National Transportation Safety Board. Do you have any follow-on questions, Mr. Barnum?

MR. BARNUM: No follow-on questions from us. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Mr. Barnum.

Mr. Stacey?

2.5

(No audible response.)

CAPT CALLAGHAN: No questions from Mr. Stacey.

Mr. Barcott, any follow on questions for you, sir?

MR. BARCOTT: None, thank you very much, Captain.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: No follow-on questions for Mr. Barcott.

So, gentlemen, I would have -- I will tell you, I greatly appreciate this discussion, and I thank you -- you guys have brought a lot of information not only to the investigation, but to the -- just to the public in general in starting to understand some of these challenges, understanding that the, the answer isn't a simple answer, but it is complex and it's worth taking a look at.

So what I want to do now is ask you three gentlemen, so now that we've gone through quite a few lines of questioning, I'd like

to ask you gentlemen if there's something that you believe that we didn't cover in our questioning that would bring value to this Marine Board and its investigation following this casualty.

MR. ZANKICH: I have heard — this is Paul Zankich — that in the Navy manual, there are procedures for avoiding icing or avoiding ice accumulation. Some of them may seem strange or something about wrapping your railing in saran wrap or something like that, but I haven't read that. And that might be one of the documents that Bud or that organization would include in their stability instructions to people and such.

If there are certain things -- can you, can you spray a coat of super slip on something and therefore it won't accumulate ice? We have modern technologies now that make vessels slip through the water real easily. Can those be applied to superstructures or rigging or even pots? Without damaging the environment, you know. There possibly are technological advances that we're missing that could keep these boats from icing up. Can you, with a garden sprayer, spray super de-icer on and not have to beat it with baseball bats to get rid of it or -- I don't know.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Lieutenant McPhillips, can you pull up Exhibit 70?

Sir, just for the record, is this the manual you're referring to, sir?

MR. ZANKICH: I believe --

MR. BRONSON: That's the one that I've seen, yes.

1

MR. ZANKICH: -- yeah.

2

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Thank you, sir.

3

Lieutenant McPhillips, you can take that down.

4

Sorry to interrupt you, sir. I just wanted to confirm that for the record. Either of the other two gentlemen?

5

MR. PARROTT: I have not seen that.

7

MR. BRONSON: I've, I've seen that, and I, I seem to recall a couple of other documents, but I -- if I find them, I'll send them to you.

9

11

12

8

10

CAPT CALLAGHAN: I guess I'll ask the, the rest of you gentlemen, anything else that we haven't considered here today that, that you would like to add?

13

MR. PARROTT: Not from me.

14

MR. ZANKICH: I want to commend the fact that you're doing this investigation because the -- I understand you opened this

15

thing with a mayday call. You know, I'd hate to get a mayday call

1617

where the guy says, I'm rolling over. I'd like to avoid those.

18

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Yes, sir.

1920

I, I don't want to make a huge thing of it, but I'm one of the few

MR. BRONSON: Let, let, let me make one, one comment.

21

around that has held a master's license and has fished and all

22

like that. And those are my friends out there. I'd like to do

2324

the best job I can for them. I've got a hole in, in my education, in my knowledge, and that is, how do these pots really ice? From

25

talking to them, what they tell me the pots look like doesn't

match what the regulations are requiring. Can we please do some research and find out what the truth is so we don't have to repeat this subject any more than is absolutely necessary?

MR. ZANKICH: Thanks, Bud, for getting involved.

Thanks, Jonathan, for getting involved.

MR. BRONSON: Before we, before we end this discussion, it might be interesting for those that don't know the history of it all that the states of Washington, Oregon, and Alaska were the only -- only states before about 1960 that required naval architects to be licensed as PEs. And the three of us are in the early group of that. Now it's a national organization, and I think we're doing a good job of it, but that's why, why the three of us are, are here.

MR. PARROTT: I wonder which one of you graded my PE test.

MR. BRONSON: Who, yours?

MR. PARROTT: Yeah.

2.5

MR. BRONSON: No, no, I wasn't -- I wasn't rating the tests at that point.

MR. ZANKICH: I, I was grading the tests, but we passed it around. Every question got graded by three PEs.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Well, gentlemen --

MR. ZANKICH: And so they were anonymous.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: -- I couldn't have -- I couldn't ask for any more from you guys today, and I, I -- on behalf of the Coast Guard and the Marine Board of Investigation, I do want to thank you for

your time today, for your participation up to this point, and with hopes that we can continue to work together and, as you said, to avoid being in this place again at any time in the future with the goal to prevent such casualties moving forward. So, gentlemen, I thank you and I, again, look forward to continuing communication with you gentlemen moving forward.

MR. PARROTT: Any time. Any time.

MR. ZANKICH: Yeah, any time.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: As we close, I want to thank you for your patience as well. I know we took you well beyond your scheduled timeframe, but certainly the testimony we heard from you gentlemen today was worth every bit of that time, and we thank you for that. So, at this point, the three of you gentlemen are now released as witnesses from this formal hearing. We thank you for your testimony and cooperation.

If, at a later time, I determine that this Board needs additional information from you, we will contact you directly. If you have any questions about the investigation, you may contact us through the investigation recorder, Lieutenant Ian McPhillips. Gentlemen, thank you very much.

(Witnesses excused.)

MR. ZANKICH: I think I speak, I think I speak for all three of us that if you guys have questions, call us. We're here.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, sir.

At this time, before we go to recess, I'd like to just make

sure we put Exhibit 123, which was the additional photo that we 1 2 brought up, into the record. 3 It's now 1112 Pacific Standard Time. This hearing will now go into recess and is scheduled to resume at 1300. 4 5 (Off the record at 11:12 a.m.) 6 (On the record at 12:59 p.m.) 7 CAPT CALLAGHAN: The time is now 1300, and this hearing is 8 now back in session. At this time, we will hear testimony from Ms. Cecily Lowenstein. Ms. Lowenstein, Lieutenant McPhillips will now administer 10 your oath and ask you some preliminary questions. 11 12 (Whereupon, 13 CECILY LOWENSTEIN 14 was called as a witness and, after being first duly sworn, was 15 examined and testified as follows:) 16 LT McPHILLIPS: Please be seated, ma'am. Please state your full name and spell your last name. 17 18 THE WITNESS: My name is Cecily Lowenstein. My last name is L-o-w-e-n-s-t-e-i-n. 19 20 LT McPHILLIPS: Please identify counsel or representative if 21 present? 22 THE WITNESS: Counsel is Lieutenant Commander Pekoske. 23 Did I get that right?

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

LT McPHILLIPS: Please have them state and spell their last

24

25

LCDR PEKOSKE: Yes.

name, as well as their company relationship.

2.5

LCDR PEKOSKE: Good afternoon. I'm the witness counsel. My name is Matthew Pekoske, last name P-e-k-o-s-k-e. I'm a U.S. Coast Guard Judge Advocate Agency Counsel for all Coast Guard witnesses.

LT McPHILLIPS: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Lowenstein, please tell us, what is your current employment and position?

THE WITNESS: I am currently the deputy program manager in CG9 for CG9 335. It's the C4 ISR acquisition program.

LT McPHILLIPS: What are your general responsibilities in that job?

THE WITNESS: I act as the XO for program management for three non-major programs inside the acquisition directorate.

LT McPHILLIPS: Thank you. Can you briefly tell us your relevant work history?

THE WITNESS: I have been -- in my early years I worked as a naval architect starting in 1997 in the off-shore oil industry. I moved to D.C. and worked for various subcontractors, including supporting the deep water project for the Coast Guard. I worked for multiple naval architecture firms doing a variety of naval architecture. In 2010, I joined the U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Center as a staff naval architect where I was employed through 2016. Then I transitioned to the technical manager for the Polar Security Cutter Program acquisition here at Coast Guard,

and I then went to Eisenhower School right there, and I've been in 1 2 my current position about six months. 3 LT McPHILLIPS: What is your education related to your position? 4 5 THE WITNESS: I have an undergraduate degree in mechanical 6 engineering, a master's degree in naval architecture and off-shore 7 engineering, an MBA, and I also have my Masters of Science in Global Policy and Resource Strategy from the Eisenhower School. 8 9 LT McPHILLIPS: Do you hold any professional licenses or 10 certificates relating to your position? 11 THE WITNESS: Yes, I owe -- I have a Professional Engineering 12 License in Naval Architecture and Off-Shore Engineering since 13 2003. 14 LT McPHILLIPS: Thank you, ma'am. Captain Callaghan will now 15 have some follow-up questions for you. 16 CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you for being here with us today, Ms. Lowenstein. I'm going to turn it over for the -- to 17

Lieutenant Commander Comerford to ask the primary Coast Guard questions.

Mr. Comerford?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

LCDR COMERFORD: Thank you, Captain.

EXAMINATION OF CECILY LOWENSTEIN

BY LCDR COMERFORD:

Good afternoon, Ms. Lowenstein. All my questions are related to the work of the United States Coast Guard in the realm of the

safety of commercial fishing vessel operations.

A. Okay.

2.5

Q. Thank you for being, thank you for being on the line with us and attending this hearing virtually today. If at any point we ask a question that you do not understand or cannot hear because of technical difficulties, please do not hesitate to state -- say so and we will repeat or rephrase the question. We will take breaks throughout the hearing as necessary, but if you need a break at any point, please let us know.

Using the Zoom platform, we have the ability to share exhibits virtually. The recorder, Lieutenant McPhillips, will put any necessary exhibits up on your virtual desktop. If at any point you need to point something out on an exhibit, Lieutenant McPhillips will highlight the area for -- for the benefit of the Board and the livestream audience. When we look at these exhibits, please take your time to refresh your memory or acquaint yourself with the information as necessary. We have provided the recorder, Lieutenant McPhillips, with, with any -- Lieutenant McPhillips will put up any exhibit on the monitor at any time.

So to begin, just some general background questions today.

Have you ever worked -- Ms. Lowenstein, could you please describe your position and duties while working at the Coast Guard Marine Safety Center?

A. I was a staff engineer in what they called an HQ or major vessel branch. I began working here in May of 2010, and one of

the, I guess, collateral duties you could say that I picked up was in late 2010, we started getting asked for assistance from Sector Puget Sound conducting stability analysis for commercial fishing vessels that were members of their ACSA Program.

As a direct result of the -- I believe it was the Alaska Ranger Marine MBI, there was a recommendation that came out of that, that the Marine Safety Center start looking at the stability at the request of the OCMI to make sure that the stability for those commercial fishing vessels, the big processors, were -- met the applicable requirements at that time. And then, throughout the rest of my time at the Marine Safety Center, I worked cruise ships, container vessels, passenger ferries, but the majority of my work really was largely commercial fishing vessels.

- Q. And just for clarification, did -- were you doing commercial fishing vessel work throughout your tenure from 2010 to 2016 at the Marine Safety Center?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Now, going back a little bit further, could you discuss your

 -- what you had to do to initially certify for your professional
 engineer certification?
- A. So I had to take an engineer in training exam when I was still in college, and then after six or ten years of work experience for, I guess, accredited -- it's not really accredited, but naval architecture firms that qualify as giving me real naval architecture experience, you apply and then sit for the exam. So

- I graduated from Berkeley in '97, so my four year degree from an accredited Clarkson (ph.), along with my -- I took it in 2003, to then follow on six years of experience enabled me to sit for that test. And pass, obviously.
- Q. Now, with particular focus on the naval architecture, what are the requirements for maintaining your professional engineer's license?
- A Here in the State of Virginia, we're required to do
 continuing education classes. The license is renewed every two
 years, so you have to continue to demonstrate that you have and
 use your technical expertise, taking additional classes, attending
 (indiscernible) conferences, things like that.
- Q. Would you mind going a little bit more in depth on that for the state that you're licensed? How does that work? What do you have -- what are the requirements? Is there a certain number of hours --
- 17 A. Oh, so --
- 18 | Q. -- a year?

enhancement to your knowledge.

23

- A. I believe it's 80 hours a year, or maybe it's 80 hours per the two years. I would have to look it up exactly. But there's a requirement that you self-certify that you have done or participated in, you know, workload or some sort of professional
- Q. Okay. And further to that end, are there any requirements to stay up to date with software technology, current resources

available, or is it broad?

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- A. Not that I'm aware of. For the most part, doing naval architecture, you have to stay up to date just in order to be most efficient with your work, but I don't believe there's any requirement in my state, or at least where I'm licensed, to keep up to speed on current -- like (indiscernible) software or (indiscernible) development software per se.
- 8 Q. In 2010, approximately 2010 I think, you returned a submittal 9 from Mr. Brian Culver for the fishing vessel *Sea Venture* and --
- 10 A. Mr. Bruce Culver, yes.
 - Q. Correct, Mr. Bruce Culver. I misspoke, thank you. Mr. Bruce Culver. The original return letter was provided to you as Exhibit 066. Lieutenant McPhillips, can you bring up Exhibit 066 please? And, while we're bringing this up, Ms. Lowenstein, this letter that was issued is labeled as returned for revision in the opening paragraph, but there's six, six comments that apply to this letter. The first question is, did you draft this letter?
- 18 A. I did.
- Q. Okay. I would like to take the opportunity to just walk through each one of the six comments and just in your own terms, can you explain, from your memory, what you had noted, and if not that, if you could give us perspective of if -- why this matters in terms of the safety of a fishing vessel?
- A. Sure. So reference (a) contains two drawings. Both of these drawings show two seawater ballast tanks, port and starboard,

between frames F and J. However, reference (a) does not address the, the seawater ballast tanks. Further, on correspondence from Office in Charge of Marine Inspection, it appears that these tanks have not been completely disconnected.

2.5

Please -- so the first one is a note that, in order to ensure that we understand the stability of a vessel, we need to make sure we have a full understanding of all of the tanks, whether they're in use, so that you can have a free surface for changing tank levels for the different weather conditions and also -- just also general arrangement of the tanks so that when you're doing the stability, you were creating a GAS or hull model that you can make sure that model is truly representative of the vessel that you're trying to do stability on.

So I was concerned that there was some tanks shown, and there was some discrepancies between two drawings, and it appeared that they may have been disconnected, but it wasn't necessarily clear in the, in the -- from the drawings I was provided to try to create a model or validate a model that was provided to me, exactly what the situations were that those tank layouts were.

The next one down is that the individual, Mr. Culver, was utilizing two separate steps of stability criteria, and typically, you only use one set of stability criteria. For example, you wouldn't mix something from Subchapter S -- 46 C.F.R. Subchapter S with stability under 46 C.F.R. 28 or Subpart C for the uninspected fishing vessels.

1 2 C 3 O 4 b 5 a 6 t 7 w 8 b

2.5

Item three, so this was actually one of my, my bigger concerns with this particular vessel is there was a whole list of openings indicated that were provided as a part of the stability booklet, and it wasn't clear to me which ones were actually being able to be secured weathertight or watertight, which would enable them to or to not have to be used as a downflooding point. And with these commercial fishing vessels, there's usual very low free board, and so being able to understand if something is going to be a downflooding point and when it's going to downflood is kind of a critical stability aspect.

- Q. So for clarification on this one, you say please provide a list of downflooding points. Is this something normally expected in the stability packet or was it information that you would want as supporting information from the submitter?
- A. So it's important that it be included as a part of the stability booklet. That was specifically for the ACSA vessels requirements that they have this list of downflooding points and what type of closures were on them and whether these closures were open or closed as a part of fishing operations, because there had been such concern with potential downflooding points for things that may have been accidentally left open that would normally be opened while fishing, to ensure that they're closed during transit or during heavy weather.

So this, this would be a requirement for load line to have this information available and it, it was a requirement for these

ACSA vessels. And typically, to understand when you're running up against the stability criteria, this information would be provided as a part of stability calculations. Not necessarily as a part of stability instructions, although it is usually identified so that the master knows what, what point it is you're talking about being submerged when -- that the calculations are based on.

2.5

- Q. And just kind of coming full circle here, the correspondence from the Office in Charge of Marine Inspections, was that the indications to you that there may be other downflooding points not contained in the information provided?
- A. Yes. Yes, they identified -- so they were, they were my eyes on the ground. Like, normally, if I was doing -- or if I was working for a non-government agency, being a naval architect, I would be inspecting the boat, talking to the operator to understand how the vessel's used, what hatches are open when, et cetera, where the downflooding points are. But the, the Office in Charge of Marine Inspection was my eyes on the ground, able to validate and verify the information -- or limited information that I was seeing that was submitted to me.
- 20 Q. Lieutenant McPhillips, if we can move to the next page and continue on? We'll try and zoom in a little bit here for you.
 - A. Sure, that's fine. We're talking about hull models. Due to what appears to be two different hull models being used in this analysis, we note that there are inconstancies between the volumes and center of gravities of tanks, the holds and the loads in

between cod fishing and crab loading conditions.

Basically, depending on which load case I was looking at, there were discrepancies and inconsistencies in the information that I would expect to be similar across -- what do I want to call it -- the various loading conditions of the vessels. So I basically requested that a single hull file be used, and then the next one is for him to -- again, I was looking at a paper copy of the stability calculations, and I didn't have a lines plan, I didn't have a hull model myself to be able to really understand what was going on, and so I wanted to understand why there were differences in tank volumes between two loading conditions that supposedly were for the same vessel.

And then the next item is me asking for a copy of the lines plan. So typically, at the Marine Safety Center, we would do an independent hull file or use a lines plan that validates the hull file that would be provided by a submitter.

- 17 Q. Was there --
- 18 A. And then the last --
- 19 Q. -- when you did receive one, and just to kind of -- on that
- 20 one, when the hull file was received by the Marine Safety Center,
- 21 | were there any steps taken to -- when you were there during your
- 22 | time --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

2.5

- 23 A. Validate it?
- 24 Q. -- validate that information?
 - A. I -- I actually ended up developing, I think, three to five

of my own hull files just because I couldn't reconcile the information that was on the lines plan relative to the information that had been in the stability booklet that I was looking at. So I ended up developing multiple hull files myself to try to figure out what the actual representation I believe is an independent (indiscernible) would be most representative of the vessel. And that's what I ended up using long term in my stability calculations.

- Q. Oh, I'm just a little curious here. Ms. Lowenstein, when you make a hull file, do you remember about how much time it would take for one of these fishing vessels to develop --
- 12 A. Well --

2.5

- 13 | Q. -- a model?
 - A. -- again, it depends on whether you're working from an old lines plan where you actually have to collect the data off of the curve or if you're provided with an offset table. I don't think this vessel had an offset table. I think it took me a little bit of time, and part of the issue is that you are trying to read points of hull geometry off of a, you know, a drawing. So it tends to be something you need to check and verify, and as you create the frames of the vessel, make sure it's smooth and that the -- it's -- the hull model that you're working with, really does represent what's, what's being shown to you on the lines plan.
 - Q. Okay. All right. Thank you. You can continue on to six

please.

2.5

A. And so the whole reason why the OCMI initially called me about this vessel, the *Sea Venture*, is they were asking permission to put a -- I think -- I believe it was a 20-ton bait box up behind the pilot house. And understanding that the, the stability of these vessels is, is often -- can be precarious depending on the loading condition you're in and the kind of fishing they're doing.

And so OCMI had asked us to look at the stability because they were interested in putting 20 tons up high in the vessel, which has negative impacts on stability, and wanted us to verify the vessel could handle the addition of those 21 tons on the vessel. And I was unable to verify that because I couldn't even validate for myself based on the information I had available at this time that the vessel stability was indeed okay.

I had limited information -- not sufficient information to be able to do that. And this was me expressing my concern that I had thought it was a bad idea at this point to even consider putting the bait box up up high because I couldn't validate the stability or give the OCMI assurances that the stability of the vessel was adequate.

Q. All right. So for clarification purposes, Ms. Lowenstein, that means that you're just requiring further information? It's not that it is an issue, it's that you don't have the ability to evaluate that information?

- Yes, I didn't have -- the information that was presented to me had -- I had enough questions about it that I didn't have a high level of confidence in the information I was reviewing, and also I had insufficient information to do what I always did as a Marine Safety Center staff engineer which was to independently validate the results that I was looking at. So I didn't have the information to be able to do that based on what was provided to me.
 - Q. So following these letter -- this letter and your further communication with Mr. Bruce Culver, could you describe, in your own terms, from your personal experiences, the types of interactions you had with Mr. Culver and that, that --
- 13 | A. So --

- Q. -- your impressions?
 - A. -- Mr. Culver, when I would ask a question, it would often take follow-up questions, and as he produced further information for me, it was often times creating more questions for me than it was answering due to inconsistencies between, say, a downflooding point I would ask a question about, and then I would contact the OCMI to have them validate the information that was being sent by Mr. Culver, and I would get conflicting information between what the OCMI was believing was a downflooding point versus what Mr. Culver was indicating may or may not have been a downflooding point, or a hatch open during fishing, et cetera.

And so it was this constant uncertainty on my part as to what

really was the condition of the vessel, what really were the downflooding points, how was the vessel actually being operated for the various fishing operations, because they were doing long lining and crab fishing for the Sea Venture. And the different arrangements of -- for example, they had a COMX (ph.) box that they would leave on the deck when they were doing long lining, and I, I just didn't have a complete confidence in the picture of the information that I was receiving, and it took a lot of back and forth to really try to, try to hone in and be specific enough to get the details I needed to actually be able to do my independent stability verification.

- Q. There was a bit of information thrown in there about the practices of the vessel, if you will, if I paraphrase. Were --
- 14 A. Yeah, so it's --

2.5

- 15 Q. Were you getting --
 - A. We want to make sure the stability instructions reflect how the owner's actually going to operate the boat. It gets to become really important when there's certain hatches open during fishing, the way that they put the pots in the water, the way they load or unload the deck can impact the trim and heel of the vessel, the way they load the cargo holds, whether it's a fluid filled cargo hold or not fluid filled, you know, whether they're freezing and boxing it. So all these things have an impact on the stability, and being able to understand how the vessel was used and how weight is distributed as they burn fuel and put pots in the water

or burn fuel and are long lining all come into play when you're evaluating the stability of the vessel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

22

23

24

2.5

- Q. And to -- if you put yourself back in that timeframe, were you receiving this information from one person or a group of people to develop, in your mind, what conditions you should be considering?
- So you mean the loading conditions that I should be considering for this vessel? I was getting a little bit of it 8 from Mr. Culver, some of it from the OCMI, and the OCMI was talking to the vessel owner or one -- and the -- it wasn't the 10 11 OCMI, it was the lead commercial fishing vessel examiner, the 12 OCMI's representative, to ask the specific questions and what -and so the fishing vessel person, inspector on the ground in 13 14 Seattle would go and talk to the vessel owner to try to get the information that I needed to kind of help me learn and understand 15 16 how they were using the vessel, the different ways they were fishing with the vessel, and then basically how the different 17 doors or chutes or hatches were being opened or closed during 18 those fishing operations and to validate whether they could be 19 20 closed weathertight or watertight to not be considered downflooding, et cetera. 21
 - Q. To your recollection, do you recall if Mr. Culver was submitting his, his plan, his plans and his calculations under his professional engineer certification?
 - A. I believe to submit it, it would be -- a 1092 or is it 1082?

Which if he were to submit it through the Marine Safety Center, it basically entitles you to an expedited review, and I do not believe that he submitted them under his PE, but his stability booklets were stamped with his PE. So he didn't receive that expedited courtesy at the Marine Safety Center, but he did stamp his stability booklets with his PE stamp and his signature.

2.5

- Q. All right. So when you received his plans and saw the PE stamp, it did not necessarily flag an immediate review under 1092? It would -- he would have had to indicate that in his request?
- A. Yeah, and since the request for the review of the stability came through the OCMI and he was submitting it at the OCMI's request as a member of the ACSA Program, I'm not sure that the Marine Safety Center would have recognized the 1092 submission because we really -- under the normal C.F.R. statutes, Marine Safety Center doesn't have an official role in reviewing those commercial fishing vessel stabilities. It's only on behalf of the OCMI that we did that.
- Q. Could you maybe describe that a little bit better to me in the terms of when -- during your time there, when was the Marine Safety Center actually conducting reviews for certain fishing vessels?
- A. It started, to the best of my knowledge, in the fall of 2010, and I believe they are still doing it. Again, I left there in the summer of 2016. And we were asked by the Sector Puget Sound to review the stability of all of the fishing vessels enrolled in the

ACSA Program. I believe there were 50-plus of those at the time. And that included conducting oversight of the commercial fishing vessels that ABS was issuing long lines for and the associated stability instructions that they were approving on behalf of the Coast Guard as an authorized classification society. So it was basically continuous for those six years, and I know that those, those stability reviews are still going on, to the best of my knowledge.

- 9 Q. When you left there, some of the 52 vessels were still in 0 pending status, is that what you're saying?
- A. Oh, yeah. There were -- I mean, the Sea Venture, from the day I got the stability booklet until we finally got it all squared away, was about a three and a half year process. And that was largely due to the way the fishing vessel was being utilized and some discrepancies in structures and deck strength and other things that had to be corrected.
 - Q. Did you -- was this the one time you had interactions with Mr. Bruce Culver for purview or did you have interactions for other vessels with him?
 - A. He -- this is the only time I've interacted with Mr. Culver and it was only for a period from December of 2010 -- oh, is that right? Yeah, December 2010 through the summer of 2011 because I received -- I had received an updated stability booklet from Mr. Culver, and I had also received a stability booklet from another engineering firm for -- both for the Sea Venture. And I

wrote an email to the owner, Dan -- I'm sorry, I don't remember

his last name -- asking which, which stability booklet he wanted

me to review. And he said he had retained the services of a new

engineering firm to conduct the stability for the Sea Venture

moving forward. And then, from that date on, I worked with the

other engineering firm that was hired to complete the Sea Venture

stability.

- Q. Do you -- did you have further communication after that point with Mr. Culver?
- 10 A. No.

8

- 11 Q. Or did you just ask --
- 12 A. I did not.
- 13 Q. So you -- did you just ask the owner to clarify the --
- 14 | A. Yeah.
- 15 | O. -- with Mr. --
- A. I asked him to clarify and then I sent a note to Mr. Culver saying I wasn't going to be reviewing that stability booklet any further because I had talked to the owner of the vessel and he had indicated that I should be utilizing the submission of the new engineering firm as the *Sea Venture*'s stability booklet to be reviewed by us to satisfy the vessel's ACSA requirements for Puget Sound.
- 23 Q. Thank you. So now I'd like to shift gears a little bit.
- Mr. McPhillips, can you please bring up Exhibit 49? And when it comes up, Ms. Lowenstein, this is just a planned review guide for

commercial fishing vessel stability from the Marine Safety Center.

- A. Yes, I drafted this. I wrote it actually, so yes, I'm very familiar.
- Q. Can you describe to me the process you followed to produce this guide?
- A. Okay. So this -- within the Marine Safety Center we had, had very little requirement to review these commercial fishing vessels because they are uninspected, and the Marine Safety Center is only required to review inspected vessels. So when we started, as a result of the whole request by the OCMI to start looking at these commercial fishing vessels, the only other way we would have had authority to do it was some of these larger vessels are required to be load lined, so it would have been through a load line certificate, which we had designated ABS or other authorized classification societies to be able to do on our behalf. So through oversight of that would have been the only other way we as the Marine Safety Center started looking at fishing vessels.

And as I started digging into trying to identify what is the correct stability criteria, what should I be looking at for a fishing vessel, it was a very, very interesting and complex thing to try to do. And so as we started reviewing more fishing vessels and learning what we needed to know and kind of best practices and, you know, in some cases the engineering firms would do something a certain way based on the way they had interpreted one of these requirements, and so doing this work, we decided that

there were some ways we wanted to basically add another layer of conservatism because of, in my personal opinion, some of the -- I guess the way these vessels are operated increases their risk for having a stability challenge over time.

So to really make sure that we explain to them when we came to a point that we wanted them to do something more specifically, and an example I can give is most vessels do not track their TCG as a part of light ship or as a part of any of their stability calculations. The vessel is assumed to be, you know, even, evenly loaded and not in any sort of state of heel. So we found a large number of these fishing vessels had a -- more than 0.5 degrees of heel in their light ship condition, and people were using slack tanks to try to correct that light ship while they were fishing and slack fuel tanks. Well, it's okay to do that with ballasts.

So, again, there's just all these things that we're finding out that were being practices and accepted by the naval architecture firms that we recognized we would not accept for an inspected vessel. So we passed on that information and their — the inability to review that to the engineering firms as we got smarter as a group, right. You know, there was challenges with just about every fishing vessel that came across my desk. There was never a yes, it's approved right away. It was always a process. And a lot of times, it was even to the basis of the stability tests.

Some of these big fish processors, they have huge amount of

stuff that they store onboard. And for some of the early stability tests, there was huge amounts of unknown weights being kept onboard the vessels during these stability tests, and trying to get them to even remove all that stuff to truly get a sense of light ship and then weigh the equipment and the nets so we really understood what they were and how they were stored was, again, one of the challenges we had early on. And really understanding what the light ship of the vessel is is essential to understand the overall stability of the boat and really understand the weights of the equipment and things that they're moving around and the shifting of (indiscernible) and things on deck and all those kind of stuff all play into the stability of fishing vessels.

And at the time that this was put out in 2013, it was the status of the accumulation of the knowledge I had put together and kind of clarifications we'd provided the industry on where we thought it was a good idea to try to provide clarity and more conservatism to their calculations. But, again, this is guidance. It's not law. This was just our interpretation of the guidance that was out there to try to help the engineers that are doing these stability calculations to really understand what we were looking for to try to put a layer of conservatism and clarity into the calculations.

- Q. Just maybe -- I'm going to come back to one term you used earlier.
- A. Sure.

Q. The TCG. So forgive me, could you for the -- audience, the best of the audience --

A. So when you --

2.5

- Q. -- kind of explain?
- A. When you have a vessel, you have the vertical center of gravity, which people will talk about GM or KG curves, and if the vessel's KG is, is too high, that's what can cause the vessel to heel or capsize or tip over if there's an instability. The longitudinal center of gravity is the vessel's trim from stem to stern, how much of it is in the water. And the TCG would be the center of the vessel if you go from stem to stern. The TCG is where on that center line -- usually you would assume the weights of the vessel are on the center line of the water plane and then the hull structure, but for some of these boats, the TCG was actually off center in the natural light ship state vessel. So the vessel is sitting in the water at sometimes as much as seven to 15 degrees of heel in its light ship condition.

So before you put anything else on it, the vessel was not upright in its natural light ship condition; it was heeled over, which means that when you're doing stability, if you do stability to the side that it's heeled on, you're going to hit downflooding points sooner, you're going to have less riding energy. Where if you do that stability to the other side, you're actually falsely representing that you have that much more angle of heel to meet stability criteria.

You -- so typically, if you have a passenger vessel, you would assume that, that it's straight up when you're doing the stability calculations, and you don't care whether you heel the vessel to the port or the starboard. Well, we found early on that a lot of these fishing vessels had a natural list that was being corrected by fuel tanks, which is not allowed. And so, if you took away that fuel correction, the vessels would actually be heeling to one side. And so they would be getting credit for a range of stability that they didn't actually have on either the port or starboard side of the vessel depending on which way the vessel was heeling based on this -- I guess they'd call it a list based on the light ship of the vessel.

2.5

- Q. Okay. And to clarify something, prior to this plan review guide, was there any other formal guidance in place for fishing vessel review?
- A. No, but you can see that there was -- there's, there's the other plan review guides for the trim and stability booklet, the MSC plan review guide H2-O2 for stability tests, submission of stability test results, and then there's also other ones that were for trim and stability booklets and stability instructions which apply to inspected fishing vessels, which you wouldn't necessarily say applied, but there was some good information in there that, if you were looking to understand how the Marine Safety Center was looking to have you consider things for stability, like free surface, you could go and read for clarification in those other

Marine Safety Center guides. But this is the only specific one to fishing vessels that I was aware of at the time, or I created.

Q. Lieutenant McPhillips, can you shift to page 8 on this exhibit please?

CDR DENNY: You're muted.

THE WITNESS: I mean, I think it was NVIC 586, which I'm sure is referenced here. Yeah, but --

BY LCDR COMERFORD:

- Q. So Lieutenant McPhillips is putting up page 8 of Exhibit 49 right now.
- 11 A. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. In this section, it discusses ice loads. My question to you is, when you were a staff engineer and receiving these
- 14 submissions, did you ever get vessels that applied ice load?
 - A. Yes, I did. And I found that sometimes the ice loads weren't calculated in accordance with the guidance. And also, when we started looking at -- because basically what you do is you treat that -- like say if there's crab pots on the deck, you treat it like it's a big square, and you apply ice to it to get like a
- 20 weight in moment of where the ice would be, like the center of the
- 21 ice load would be, and then you apply that as a -- I guess a point
- 22 load in GHS. And I had found sometimes that the icing was not
- 23 always done in accordance with the standards that were there. And
- 24 oftentimes, you know, it was not -- how do I say -- not calculated
- 25 correctly or not as conservatively as, based on my calculation, I

was doing it.

2.5

Oftentimes, it was just a number provided without any backup calculations as to how they arrived at that number. So I would do my own calculation and arrive at a number that was oftentimes more conservative than what was provided and then usually talk to the naval architect, and between the two of us, we'd figure out what we thought the best answer was given, say, the crab pot configurations of how the crab pots were loaded, for example. But sometimes, like on the Sea Venture, they had crab pots in two, sometimes three locations on the ship, so you'd have to combine the ice loads from those various locations into, you know, a common ice load that you're applying in GHS.

- Q. Do you recall in general different ways you saw people submitting the ice loads? Because you said sometimes they weren't fully --
- 16 A. Yeah.
- 17 Q. -- your interpretations.
 - A. So a lot of times early on I -- they would give me a number and a longitudinal transverse and vertical center of gravity for that ice load without giving me an explanation of how they arrived at it. So we started requesting as a -- I think there's a list in here of stuff we wanted done to provide for us, like a general arrangement plan or other things -- that they actually show us how they calculated the ice load and what it was based on so that we can understand how they were arriving at the ice load.

Q. And then when you -- in your experiences, when you were at the Marine Safety Center and when you were evaluating the plans, were you applying it in the same manner the naval architect did that submitted or did you have your own criteria to evaluate --

A. Well, it's not --

2.5

Q. -- and validate?

A. So it's, it's -- with all things law and C.F.R., there's always room for interpretation, right. So really understanding that you -- we all understood we needed to apply an ice load, that it was one of two levels of icing depending on where the vessel was operating, how we applied that and what it really meant. So, again, it was, over time, coming to an understanding with the naval architects -- which, by the way, there's some really great naval architects that are doing the stability for these fishing boats, and I learned a lot from them as much as anything else. But all trying to do the right thing and understand what the requirement said.

And the challenge with these fishing vessels is, for years and years, they're uninspected; no one from the Coast Guard who is ultimately responsible for interpreting these regulations had been involved to give our opinion on what we thought -- how we would interpret that regulation and how we would apply an engineering solution to that regulation. So this provided an opportunity for us to do that and clarify for them. Oftentimes, our application is more conservative than what somebody in industry may interpret

to do that.

2.5

But still, at the end of the day, I mean, these, these ice loads are what we got, you know, sent down from IMO. And based on some of the icings, I mean, I've seen on those of these boats, I don't, I don't think that it's necessarily conservative as the regulations. But at the Marine Safety Center, we apply the regulations and, and either approve it based on it meeting it or not, so --

- Q. In an earlier testimony we heard perspective that naval architects apply ice loads sort of like a shoebox or similar terms, you know, top, sides.
- A. Yeah, top and side icing. And then, so one of the challenges I've found is that sometimes they would do the top and one side with the idea that the ice would be only accumulating on one side. And I'm like, no, you need to do the top and even the front and back and the sides. The exception I would give is if all the crab pots, for example, were pushed all the way up against a deck house and there was an overhang, I'd let them not consider one side of it.

But think about five sides of a cube, right. And some people will interpret it as the top and one side. And so I started looking at, you know, the application of ice on the actual affected surfaces, to -- again, to be less conservative than -- to be more conservative than what some of the engineering firms were interpreting. I can't remember exactly what the final answer was

with the number of sides and the weight and the calculations. I'd have to dig back in. But I know that we applied it more conservatively than industry did.

Q. Thank you for your time today, Ms. Lowenstein.

LCDR COMERFORD: Captain, that's the questions I have for now.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Lieutenant Commander Comerford.

At this time, Ms. Lowenstein, I'm going to pass it over to
our colleagues at the National Transportation Safety Board.

Mr. Barnum?

MR. BARNUM: Thank you, Captain.

BY MR. BARNUM:

- Q. And thank you, Ms. Lowenstein. I appreciate this. You're very knowledgeable. You're proving very knowledgeable on this topic, so you've been a great witness so far. Just a couple, couple questions, clarification to the benefit of me and possibly the public. ACSA you mentioned that earlier. Could you just remind us what that stands for?
- A. Alternate Safety Compliance -- I forget what the last A is, but essentially, in the writing of 46 C.F.R. Subchapter C Part 28, there was a requirement that all commercial fishing vessels built after -- I believe it was 1979, were required to be classed in load lines. After, classification societies within the United States generally will not take on vessels that are more than, say, 20, 25 years old, and a lot of these fishing vessels were older

- than that. So it's my understanding Sector Puget Sound stood up
 this ACSA and it was the 2006 timeframe to try to help not put
 these commercial fishermen out of business, but do to a government
 equivalent of what classification and load line requirements of
 the 46 C.F.R. Chapter 28 were intending to do.
- 6 Q. Okay. So you --
 - A. So it's, it's basically supposed to be a government-like version of classification of load lines for these boats, for, for -- it's, again, it is head and gut fish processors only.
- 10 Q. Correct. Okay. Understood. So it, it is not all commercial fishing vessels?
- 12 | A. No.

7

8

9

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- Q. All right. Okay. I want to make that clear. Now, your time there at MSC, you conducted plan reviews on these ACSA vessels, load lined vessels and --
- 16 A. So, it's --
- 17 Q. -- inspected vessels?
 - A. -- again, I wouldn't, I wouldn't say plan reviews because I wasn't reviewing -- I was only reviewing anything related to the stability and loading of the vessels. So I didn't do a longitudinal strength calculation for a vessel unless I was concerned that they were utilizing parts of the structure that I didn't think were originally designed to be a part of the watertight hull section. So it, it was only plan review for structures or something in support of validating stability --

- 1 | Q. Okay.
- 2 A. -- and loading of the vessel.
- Q. Okay. Understood. Strictly stability review. So your time there completing these reviews of stability, did you ever conduct
- 5 a review of stability assessment that wasn't part of the ACSA
- 6 Program or a load lined vessel or a --
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. -- inspected vessel?
- 9 A. Well, the commercial fishing vessels are uninspected.
- 10 Q. Right.
- 11 A. But did I review -- fishing vessel stability for a vessel
- 12 | that -- I'm sorry, can you ask that again?
- 13 Q. Yes. So in context, I'll get to it, vessels such as the
- 14 | Scandies Rose, they're not required to -- they're not members of
- 15 the ACSA Program. They're not required to carry a load line.
- 16 | They're uninspected, and their stability --
- 17 A. Okay.
- 18 Q. -- but they're required to have stability instructions. Did
- 19 you ever --
- 20 A. So if we were asked to review a vessel we weren't required to
- 21 review, I'm not sure -- like I, I never -- nothing ever came
- 22 across my desk that I wasn't either asked by an Office in Charge
- 23 of Marine Inspection to review or it wasn't required to be
- 24 reviewed either through our oversight program of ABS or through
- 25 | involvement of another OCMI.

2.5

Like I remember there were two commercial fishing vessels in the South Pacific I was asked to look at that were not a part of the ACSA Program, but there was concerns over their stability instructions. And I really don't remember the name of the two boats, but they might have been load lined, I don't recall. But there was, there was something going on with these two boats in the South Pacific that the OCMI out there had some concerns with that I was asked to look at.

But, again, it's -- vague recollection, but to the best of my knowledge, I don't believe we ever were requested to review any of these booklets for -- I'll call them the not required to be -- you know, the -- essentially, 46 C.F.R. does not require a third party to validate or verify, which is really what you're getting at with these bigger --

- 0. Correct.
 - A. -- fish processors, by putting ABS in their (indiscernible), they literally are what they call third, third party independent verifier. They're meant to be that party looking over the shoulder of the engineer, the PE, to make sure that they're doing it the right way in accordance with the law.

And so a lot of -- a large number of these fishing vessels that are out there in the world are not -- again, the PE does the stability and then that's it, right. There might be some commercial fishing vessel safety inspections. I'm not up on what the rules are since 2016, but -- and there were voluntary, you

know, fishing vessel inspections where you could come out and make sure your flares were installed correctly and other things, but I don't think there's ever been a requirement for the stability for a lot of fishing vessel fleets if it's not these large processors or something that's large enough to not require a load line to have anybody come in and look at them.

2.5

And because it's so unregulated, it's kind of like the Wild, Wild West. And there's a lot of scary things out there. I mean, some of these boats that I looked at -- like the Sea Venture was probably one of the scariest ones that I looked at the whole time, but when you actually start peeling back the layers of -- when I was running calculations on that boat on my own eventually, I had the thing downflooding at like seven degrees, which is really, really small. It's not a lot of, you know, free board and, and righting energy. I mean, most vessels that exist in the word have a free board of at least, I don't know, somewhere between six to 12 inches. These vessels were operating with a free board of two inches.

And sometimes they were operating with the draft -- forward draft of the vessel above the watertight hull boundary. They were basically overloading the vessel from the existing watertight boundary to the point that essentially the whole true watertight volume of the hull was submerged, and they had no real free board to, to speak of from an engineering perspective. And trying to explain that that's not a good thing and understanding that that's

not allowable -- well, the engineering firms know that, but they also have customers that are the fishing vessels that they make their money by having crab pots onboard. And so, until somebody's going to come in and really enforce that there is a law and you have to follow the law, you know, it's -- everyone's going to interpret it their own way and it's, it's just really difficult to try to hone in on a particular thing.

And the engineering firms I work with -- Jensen, Hockema Whalen -- they, they did a really great job of being consistent. And when we told them we wanted something done differently, they applied it and they did it, no questions asked. Their heart -- they wanted to do the right thing. They want to keep these guys safe while they're fishing. But unless somebody can really force their hand, the person who's paying them, I believe -- you know, there's -- if you don't like what Naval Architect A is saying, go down next door and get Naval Architect B and you'll probably get the loading instructions --

- Q. Sure.
- 19 A. -- you want for the loading conditions you want.
- 20 Q. Sure.

2.5

A. So, again, this not being regulated is, I think, one of the biggest challenges. Not having that third party oversight is one of the biggest challenges to making sure that any of these boats are, are safe and the stability instructions are done to the best of anyone's ability with a third party verifying that they're

- being done in accordance with whatever standard we're going to apply.
- 3 Q. Sure. Great. So -- excuse me, there's a little bit of an echo. Okay. Let's try that. Can you hear me okay?
 - A. Yeah, I'm fine.
- 6 Q. Okay. So let's -- speaking of the *Sea Venture* -- or I'm sorry, *New Venture* --
- 8 A. No, the Sea Venture was the vessel I did.
- 9 Q. Okay.

5

- 10 A. I never worked on the New Venture.
- 11 Q. Okay. Great. Sea Venture. You stated that you were very
- 12 | alarmed after you, you know, conducted your initial review of the
- documents, and then you responded to Mr. Culver, stating that you
- 14 need more information or you -- actually, I'm sorry, you stated
- 15 that you were -- the owner wanted to go with a different firm.
- 16 Did you ever hear back from him?
- 17 A. No, I did not.
- 18 | Q. Okay.
- 19 A. I never heard from Mr. Culver again, and I don't believe he
- 20 | regularly submitted any -- like, a lot of Jensen does commercial
- 21 vessels, Subchapter K vessels, H vessels. So we're familiar with
- 22 those engineers, and we work with them regularly. Mr. Culver, to
- 23 my knowledge, I don't think regularly submitted things to the
- 24 Marine Safety Center at all. He just -- the work -- work he did
- 25 was not on inspected vessels as a general rule is my

understanding. I mean, there are a lot of naval architects we run into on a regular basis. You know, I know who Mr. Bronson is. I've run into Mr. Parrott and, you know, a whole bunch of other engineers. But at the end of the day, it's like I -- no one was really familiar with him.

2.5

- Q. Okay. So, when you did get that -- when you did do that assessment, what -- is any -- is anything triggered? I mean, is there any further review of maybe the naval architect's other work that you may have come, come across? Is he put on a list? I mean, is there --
- A. So it's, it's an interesting question because I did, at the time, ask -- and this is throughout all of my fishing vessel inspections -- is there a way that we can notify the PE licensing board that we're concerned that maybe, you know, people are not introducing the level of conservatism or, or quality assurance -- I'm, I'm trying to use the right words here -- into their calculations as we would like to see, if there was a way to kind of report on that.

And I, I think I pulled the string on it, but I could never really figure out what was the proper method inside the Coast Guard by which -- and we have this list of 1092 -- basically, if you have a professional engineering license and you want to submit, normally we guarantee the 30-day turnaround time. If you want to submit something and stamp it with your PE and it's either 1082 or 1092 -- I'm sure Lieutenant Commander Comerford can

correct me -- that you get this expedited review.

Q. Okay.

2.5

A. So if you got the expedited review as the submitting PE and we found problems with your calculations, you got put on a no, you're not allowed to submit your 1092 expedited reviews at the Marine Safety Center again, because we're going to do a really thorough check, because we're not confident that, you know, you deserve an expedited review because you do such a quality job because you're PE. So we would not allow those PEs to have that expedited review process because we've gone through enough of their calculations or had concerns to a point that their, I guess, advance to the front of the line privileges were revoked.

Now, how you report a PE out in industry, again, working at the Coast Guard, it was one of those things that people are like, eh, we don't really want to go there. You know, there's, there's no formal process that I could ever identify within the Coast Guard by which I could do that. And I ran across other PEs that were not fishing vessel related that I asked that question of, but again, there was no clear, constructive way for me as an engineer representing the Coast Guard for these inspected or uninspected vessels to, to raise the flag.

Q. Sure. I want to circle back to one of my last questions here. So you talked a little bit about ABS and how they are an accredited organization that does the, you know, assessment of the stability instructions on, on vessels. What kind of oversight

does your group have over them?

2.5

A. So, every time ABS conducts a review, they are required to notify the Coast Guard that they've done a review, and the Coast Guard at the Marine Safety Center at the time pulled a certain percentage of certain types of vessels for oversight to verify that ABS was doing this work on our behalf. And so I was asked by the OCMI in Puget Sound to pull for oversight all of the ACSA vessels stability that ABS had done on our behalf. And honestly, I found not quite as many, but still a significant number of concerns — not concerns, but things not being done to the quality or conservatism that, as the interpreter of the regulations, we as the Coast Guard wanted them to do.

And so I actually sat down with a guy named Tom Gruger (ph.) at ABS, and we went through -- because they have -- they're ISO 9001 certified, so they have checklists and policies that they follow for each one of the different types of vessels, they review stability and other things, and we went through and verified that more language was added so that when the engineers at ABS were actually reviewing the stability of these large fish processing vessels, that they were interpreting it with some of the information that was in the H2-19 fishing vessel guidance that we put out there and really, you know, digging into making sure that the inspections were done.

Because they do an inspection for load line that identifies the downflooding points and stuff that then the engineer in ABS

office that's validating stability uses to validate that the right downflooding point is identified. And sometimes there were discrepancies between the load line survey and what was actually in the stability booklet that they were reviewing. And just, you know, just really trying to make it smoother and make sure that they were paying as much attention to these uninspected vessels as they were the inspected ones. And a lot of it was just no one from the Coast Guard had ever really looked at these regulations because we're not examining these vessels —

 \mathbb{Q} . Right, right.

2.5

- A. -- so to give the interpretation of what we think is the conservative way we would interpret this, you know, requirement.

 Do I actually need to include the vessel's transverse center of gravity in a dead weight or -- sorry, inclining survey or not?

 Well, when it has huge impacts on stability for some of these fishing vessels, well, yeah, we want you to, but it's not something you would typically think about.
- Q. Right.
- A. So, again, having that TCG be included was something ABS wasn't doing and we then requested that they do. A lot of these fishing vessels were being done their inclining experiments with like lots of extra stuff onboard. Well, you're only supposed to have two, two percent of anything that can't physically be like tied down to the vessel, right. If it's not welded it should come off for the light ship. Really were making sure they were

enforcing that two percent to really understand what's the -
their vessel stability look like and then purposely adding back

all the weights so you do -- you really do have a true

understanding of the loading conditions and how the vessel in a

particular loading condition is going to react to, you know, the

stability criteria, i.e. the seas.

- Q. Great, great. Well, thank you for that. And I just -- I want to see if I can summarize, and tell me if I'm correct in this. So basically, if the vessel stability instructions are required to be reviewed by ABS, the Coast Guard will take a percentage of those and do their own independent review periodically -- yearly I assume or --
- A. Yeah, and that's only if the -- so the vessels are coming to
 ABS because they're required to be load lines --
- 15 Q. Right.

7

8

9

10

11

12

- A. -- and ABS is doing those load lines certificates or trim and stability booklets in accordance with the law. They notify to us because we've given them the ability to do that on our own behalf.
- 19 Q. Right.
- A. If somebody goes to ABS to have their stability verified because the vessel is maybe classed, but we don't necessarily have a role in oversight of that, we may not necessarily get notified by ABS that they did stability on that particular vessel. So just -- it's, it's a narrow scope of group of vessels that ABS does, and then we get notified of probably 90 percent of that, and then

- 1 we would pull maybe ten percent unless directly asked to --
- 2 0. Correct.
- 3 A. -- by maybe somebody who is concerned.
- $4 \mid Q$. Okay. Okay. And then the vessels that are not regulated by
- 5 | a -- or are not reviewed by ABS and are not specifically asked for
- 6 review from the OCMI, there is no oversight by Coast Guard on
- 7 | those?
- 8 A. It would be a rare occasion if there was really -- like, I
- 9 talked about these two vessels in the Pacific Southwest, like it's
- 10 | a rare thing that you might get a call from a concerned inspector
- 11 in the field that they want --
- 12 Q. Right.
- 13 A. -- you to take a look at something specific. But it's, it's
- 14 | a rarity. That and the only other time I did stability on
- 15 commercial fishing vessels was helping out with accident
- 16 investigations, which is like what Andy Lawrence is going to do
- 17 for you guys tomorrow.
- 18 | 0. Sure.
- 19 A. That's the only other time we would look at stability for
- 20 | fishing vessels is when something bad had happened.
- 21 Q. Perfect. Okay. Understood. Thank you very much. I really
- 22 appreciate that, and it helped me out a lot.
- 23 MR. BARNUM: That's all the questions I had, Captain.
- 24 CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Mr. Barnum.
- 25 Ms. Lowenstein, I'm going to pass it around just to the --

our parties in interest.

2.5

So, Mr. Stacey, any questions for Ms. Lowenstein?
BY MR. N. STACEY:

Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Lowenstein. Nigel Stacey. Just a couple of very, very brief questions. You discussed earlier with Lieutenant Commander Comerford that you would, to best assess the stability of a vessel, you know, review the vessel and crew practices aboard a vessel. Can you tell us why it was important for you to assess stability to know those practices?

A. Okay. So the -- that -- the stability part is very

sensitive, meaning they don't have a lot of margin between what their allowable KG is and where they're operating at the actual loaded condition of the vessel. So it could mean a difference of how you unload crab pots into -- how you load and unload crab pots in what order. If you did it in a certain order, you'd exceed the stability criteria. If you did it in a different order you'd pass.

So you'd want to make sure the stability instructions -- in some cases, the naval architects were telling the crew the best way to load and unload crab pots to keep them within the stability criteria. The, the engineer firm that ended up finally doing the Sea Venture did an amazing job. They ended up running, I think, in the neighborhood of -- sometimes they would run 1,000 different stability loading conditions against the different criteria to show how crab pots were loaded and unloaded, the sequence in which

you should be taking crab pots off a certain part of the boat, again, burn fuel in what sequence.

2.5

Like it's -- it becomes a very specific mathematical -- like you leave, you leave, you know, port with this many crab pots and fuels in this tank. In order to keep the vessel within stability limits, you have to burn these fuel tanks in this order to this percentage and then unload crab pots in a certain way. And that -- I mean, we did that with the Sea Venture. Her stability margins were narrow enough that we actually had to very, very deliberately examine how the vessel was unloaded and unloaded on a regular basis to be sure that they operated her within -- inside the stability limits.

And so we talked to the operator to be like, what do you do? What's the process you follow? And then within what they did, we further guided them to keep them within the stability limits that we as naval architects understood and together found -- again, some of these operating instructions or current stability booklets are quite -- how do I say? I don't want to say involved because the naval architects would take the, the stability -- and some of these things you do in stability calculations, we took out the ability of these guys to do a stability calculation and gave them instructions that said, when these tanks are loaded this way, here's the number of crab pots you can carry.

When it's -- you know, and it was -- I can only encourage you to go look at -- you know, have -- see if you can have an

engineering firm produce one of these, but the idea is that these 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 You know, like simple things like that. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 they have captains that understand the, the -- the license to

24

2.5

guys don't have stability instructions. When you're doing the stability instructions for a big ferry, the master's trained in stability. They know how to do these calculations and what it means. These fishing guys don't. So to really try to be very clear, concise, and direct with what they should do and how they should do it in a way that meant something to them to keep them inside these stability criteria without them having to understand what a righting arm curve or what GM is or anything. And to make sure they understood that icing's bad, right. And, and to be careful about certain things. And, you know, also, don't put stuff there. You're deck's not designed to carry a load there. So, so it's fair then the loading and unloading is obviously a very important one. Would you have a set set of questions, a standard set of questions you would ask each vessel and operator? It really, again, depended on the size of the vessel, the kind of fishing that they were doing. And, and so these were all head and gut fisher processers, right. But there were some long liners, there were some cod ends and other things. And so depending on the type of fishing they were doing and the size of the boat, we would ask question a little bit differently. Because these big huge fisher processer are very -- you know,

> FREE STATE REPORTING, INC. Court Reporting Transcription D.C. Area 301-261-1902 Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

operate these vessels require stability instructions versus the

small kind of mom and pop, I've got five to seven people, it might be mariners and crew onboard and everyone else is -- think of them as like a factory worker. They're not mariners. They're people working inside a processing plant, which in some cases were 120 of 137 person crew, right. So really making sure that it's simplified enough that you're keeping the people safe who are on there and making sure that the small mom and pops can understand how to operate their vessel in a safe manner in a way that works based on their knowledge level.

2.5

- Q. Are you aware of any documents out there or guidance where you, depending on the kind and size of vessel that you have, look so that when you do go and speak with these operators, they'll be possibly more prepared to answer those questions?
- A. Honestly, there are two engineering firms I work with the most, Jensen and Hockema Whalen, are the most knowledgeable, in my mind, of the different ranges and types of fishing vessels, and I know based on the engineers that they work with that they may have something similar to that that they use. Because as, as engineers and engineering firms, like anything, you create job aids. You create things that are repeatable so that you can take less time to do something. Again, it's all about being efficient in the job you're doing. And I believe there were some check sheets that the —— maybe Office in Charge of Marine Inspection Sector Puget Sound might have as well, but I think that's more safety related than necessarily like details of how the vessel was operated.

1 | Q. Okay.

2.5

A. And it was only over time that I started to understand what questions to ask and, and how these vessels were actually operated. I mean, if you don't understand how they -- they're operated and the terms they use and the rhythm of what they're doing, it's really hard to actually be able to do stability in a meaningful way. You have to understand who these people are, what they're operating, how they're working, and the challenges they're facing.

Q. Certainly so. Thank you very much for your testimony today.

It's been very helpful.

MR. N. STACEY: Captain, those are all the questions I have.
CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Mr. Stacey.

I'm going to pass to Mr. Barcott.

Ms. Lowenstein, just in the interest of time, I am going to ask if you -- if Mr. Barcott has any questions that we just try and be as brief as possible.

THE WITNESS: Sure.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Mr. Barcott?

MR. BARCOTT: Thank you, Captain.

I appreciate your testimony. I don't have any questions.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Mr. Barcott.

Ms. Lowenstein, I greatly appreciate you time today. I really appreciate you contributing to this hearing and I appreciate your time and bearing with us in the virtual

environment here.

2.5

THE WITNESS: No problem.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: So at this point, you are now released as a witness from this formal hearing. Thank you for your testimony and cooperation. If I later determine that this Board needs additional information from you, we'll contact you through our -- your counsel. If you have any questions about this investigation, you may contact the investigation recorder, Lieutenant Ian McPhillips. Thank you again for your time.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

CAPT CALLAGHAN: The time is now 1405. This hearing will go into a brief recess, and we will resume at 1415.

(Off the record at 2:05 p.m.)

15 (On the record at 2:14 p.m.)

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. The time is 1415. This hearing is now back in session. We will now hear from Mr. John Lawler.

Mr. Lawler, Lieutenant McPhillips will now read -- will now administer your oath and ask you some preliminary questions. Lieutenant McPhillips?

LT McPHILLIPS: Please stand and raise your right hand. (Whereupon,

JOHN LAWLER

was called as a witness and, after being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:)

1 LT McPHILLIPS: Please be seated, sir. Please state your 2 full name and spell your last name. 3 THE WITNESS: John Lawler, Lima-Alpha-Whiskey-Lima-Echo-Romeo. 4 5 LT McPHILLIPS: Please identify counsel or representative, if 6 present. 7 THE WITNESS: Joseph Stacey. 8 LT McPHILLIPS: Please have them state and spell their last 9 name, as well as their company or firm. 10 MR. J. STACEY: My name is Joe Stacey with the firm Stacey 11 and Jacobsen, and I'm here with John Lawler. 12 LT McPHILLIPS: Please tell us, what is your current 13 employment and position? 14 MR. J. STACEY: I am a partner with the law firm of Stacey 15 and Jacobsen. I apologize. Mr. Lawler, please tell us what 16 LT McPHILLIPS: 17 is your current employment and position? THE WITNESS: I'm currently doing odd jobs at this point 18 since I have not been able to fish since the accident. So that's 19 20 not really specific. In general, doing what I can get to get by right now. 21 22 LT McPHILLIPS: Can you briefly tell us your relevant work 23 history? 24 THE WITNESS: I've been fishing for the last 12 years

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

roughly. Before that -- there wasn't really much before that.

25

Just odd, odd jobs as well.

2.5

LT McPHILLIPS: Can you please describe your education related your position as a commercial fisherman?

THE WITNESS: I've ran boats. I owned my own boat. Sorry, I'm really nervous right now. I took the 100-ton course. I never followed through with getting a license itself because I was out at sea and you're only allotted six months to actually procure that after passing the test.

LT McPHILLIPS: Do, do you hold any licenses or certificates related to your job now?

THE WITNESS: Negative, sir.

LT McPHILLIPS: All right. Thank you, sir. Captain Callaghan will now have follow up questions for you.

EXAMINATION OF JOHN LAWLER

BY CAPT CALLAGHAN:

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Lawler. And, on behalf of the, the Coast Guard and behalf of the Marine Board of Investigation, thank you for being here. And I'd like to extend our extreme gratitude for your participation and our deepest condolences for the loss experienced during this tragedy. So again, thank you for your, your willingness to be here in person today. I think we all have a lot to learn from your experience and, you know, not only from -- to help better understand the facts surrounding the case, but as a survivor, we -- that provides a lot -- a great opportunity for everybody to gain some knowledge and see how we

can make improvements in the future.

There's a (indiscernible) this, this will be done. Any evidence that'll be pulled up, any exhibits, Lieutenant McPhillips will pull up on the screen in front of you and on the, the big screen behind me for you to view. If for some reason that you have trouble seeing it or have trouble understanding a question, please feel free to stop, ask me to rephrase the question or just slow down, and we'll make that happen for you.

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

13

14

15

- Q. We have some scheduled breaks, but if at any time you need additional breaks or you need to take a short recess, please let us know, and we will.
 - So, Mr. Lawler, can you just -- I, I know Lieutenant
 McPhillips asked a few background questions. Can you tell us how
 long you've been a commercial fisherman?
- 16 A. Roughly the past 12 years.
- 17 Q. Okay. And what areas have you fished in previously?
- 18 A. I started out -- well, I guess my career goes a little
- 19 further back, but as far as commercial goes, about 12 years.
- 20 | Prior to, I did some sport fishing on charter vessels down in
- 21 Southern California. My first initial experience on a fishing
- 22 | boat was in Southern California as well in the squid fishery out
- 23 of San Pedro, California.
- Q. And with regards to your experience in, in the Alaska

 5 fisheries, what types of fish catch or seasons have you worked

previously?

1

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

- A. I, I didn't hear that, sorry.
- 3 Q. So with regard to your experience in the Alaska fishing 4 region, which fisheries have you been involved in fishing?
 - A. Bristol Bay drift netting, also red crab season, opilio season, pot cod season, state and federal. No dragging at all.
 - Q. And so, aside from non-merchant -- merchant marine -- mariner credentials, do you have any other formal certifications? For example, first aid training, EMT, any stability or safety training in regards --

(High pitched ringing sound.)

CDR DENNY: It's an Amber Alert.

THE WITNESS: Amber Alert. Do I -- so you -- say that again now?

BY CAPT CALLAGHAN:

- Q. So aside from Coast Guard credentials, do you have any other formal training, first aid, any basic safety training for --
- A. I don't hold anything currently, but all through my years of my career, I've held CPR, also my AB, a few other things as well.

 Advanced firefighting and such.
- Q. Have, have you ever attended any of the NPFVOA training courses?
- A. No, just the -- a few, like the AB license out of like San Diego and whatnot. Nothing was ever done up in Alaska here.
- 25 Q. And have you ever -- had you ever sailed on any vessels in

- similar configuration to the Scandies Rose before?
- A. Well, this would be my second aft house boat. I've fished a season on the *Wizard*, which was also an aft house boat, but the rest of them all have been house forward boats.
- 5 0. Any differences between the two vessels?
- 6 A. In, in what regard would you say?
- 7 Q. Just any, any -- I guess in regards to, I guess, in 8 operation, operationally?
- A. No, generally, generally speaking, you know, we kind of have the same program. Everyone knows their place and their job. And the only thing really different is I didn't know a lot of the guys on, on the *Scandies* personally.
- 13 Q. Had you sailed with any of the crew from the Scandies before?
- A. Dean Gribble, I had, I had sailed with him prior to this. We did red crab on the Western Mariner together.
- 16 Q. And had you ever had -- have you ever been on another trip on the Scandies Rose before this --
- A. Negative. I've only seen the boat in passing. And as I said, I, I -- well, I don't know if I said this, but I own a
- 20 Bristol Bay boat, and we would see them in the bay tendering.
- 21 Q. In, in what capacity did you -- had, had you worked with
- 22 Mr. Gribble before or just known, known of him?
- A. I had never known him prior to working on the Western

 Mariner. I completed the -- but we did a little bit of black cod,

 and then we went into the red crab soon thereafter.

Q. Okay. So thank you. That's, that's some -- just some background questions. My intent now is what I'm going to -- the way I'd want to -- intend to form the rest of the questions is kind of talk about prior to the voyage, and then we'll go to into once, once you got underway and work up into the accident itself. So prior to the voyage, what was your employment directly leading up to employment with the *Scandies Rose*?

- A. Well, I had just got done on the Western Mariner, as, as I stated earlier. And up until then, I was going to make a change, go on a different boat for the opilio season. So we just had that break in between, and that's when I started making phone calls to reach out and contact someone that may have an opening on their vessel for the winter.
- Q. And, and how did you come about the, the job on the *Scandies*?

 You said you made some phone calls. How, how far before the voyage had you been hired by them?
- A. I was actually pretty delayed, honestly, because I had gotten in contact to Gary himself. He was acquainted with a mutual friend. Her name was Stephanie Anthony (ph.). She was a bartender in Dutch Harbor, so we all kind of knew each other. And she name dropped me to him, and he reached out to me and let me know that there was a potential opening. They weren't sure if someone was going to make it back. You know, it was kind of a wishy washy type deal.

Waited a few days, then I started kind of reaching out to him

saying, you know, I -- it's cutting close to the season's going to start. I need to fill a spot. Otherwise, I'm going to be without work for the winter. So he finally said, okay, you know, we're going to go ahead and take you with us. I said great. And that's kind of how that whole thing started there.

- Q. And so were you aware if there was someone who was in -- scheduled to sail in your -- in that position prior to your employment?
- Yeah, he had told me that. And I stood by -- you know, was Α. standing by for a little bit, and it was literally on the same day I, I got another call from another boat, the Sandra Five. Captain Bob there had called and offered me a job. But in the same day I'd verbally committed to, without a plane ticket of course, but verbally committed to Mr. Cobban that I would go with him. turn had to tell him, Bob, that, you know, I had already made a verbal commitment and that was my word, so I'm sorry, I have to deny the job that you're offering me right now.
 - Q. Okay. And, and once you had the conversation with Captain Cobban, can you tell me -- just explain what the process was to complete your employment?
 - A So he put me in line with Gelia Cooper, which you guys have already spoke with. She in turn called me, a whole line of paperwork. I mean, nothing -- I'm really used to doing all that kind of paperwork, but it was a little extensive. I don't know if it was due to prior insurance issues or not, but like background

- checks and, you know, all sorts of things like that. I mean, your standard drug tests and, and so forth.
 - Q. Lieutenant McPhillips, can you pull up Exhibit 17 please?
 Okay, while he's pulling this up -- it should be the employment contracts. So do you recall what kind of things that -- once we get that up -- so does this look familiar to you, Mr. Lawler?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. And I, I know this one on here isn't yours. Yours would be later in, but I just wanted to have this as -- to -- for you to verify that this is the type of agreement that you signed when employed by the Scandies Rose.
 - A. Yes, sir. And it's, it's all -- most contracts are generally pretty standard as far as like any prior injuries and what your percentage is going to be. Generally speaking, it's a lot less than what your actual percentage is as it shows, I think, further down in that document that you're started with an X amount percentage per pay and on completion of the season you receive the rest as a, quote/unquote, "bonus."
 - Q. Okay. And do you recall any other -- so you mentioned a health -- kind of a background questionnaire on your health. Any other provisions within this regarding drug and alcohol use or anything else?
- A. Yeah. I, I mean, it's, like I said, standard. So generally speaking, every contract (indiscernible) I've ever been on is zero tolerance, according to the paperwork.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. Lieutenant McPhillips, you can pull that exhibit down please. And, Lieutenant McPhillips, would you mid pulling up Exhibit 081 please? Okay. And can you go down to the last page please? Mr. Lawler, can you tell us if this -- can you verify that this, this is -- this shows a drug test that you had completed?
- $7 \mid A$. Yeah. Yes, sir, that's -- yep, that is mine.
- 8 Q. And where was this drug test administered?
- 9 A. That was in Anchorage, Alaska, not too far from my house.
- 10 | Q. And what was the -- what were the results of this drug test?
- 11 A. Negative for everything.

15

Rose?

- Q. Okay. Thank you. Lieutenant McPhillips, you can take that down please. And so, in your -- for your employment on the
- Scandies, what position were you employed for on the Scandies
- 16 A. I, I was just hired as a deckhand.
- Q. And as a deckhand on the *Scandies*, what were the -- what were working to be?
- A. Main, main functions are, are just everything that has to do with fishing. We're, you know, hauling the gear, you know, counting crab. I mean, I would also take other, you know, responsibilities on, too, even though I wasn't hired for it, but that's just always been my MO. Art Ganacias, the chief engineer on there, I would help him go do some of his work because I had experience prior. But as far as what I was hired to do was just

merely the, the deckhand work, throwing hook, counting crab, tying the boat up, taking wheel watches. The list goes on.

2.5

- Q. Okay. I'm going to move to the time so -- now, in regards to time, once you've, you've been employed by *Scandies Rose*, can you please describe everything from the time you landed in Kodiak and, you know, to the time you got -- your initial boarding of the *Scandies Rose*? So from the time, you know, getting to Kodiak, getting onboard?
- Yeah, so I, I originally flew in with -- it would have been Α. Art, David -- no, excuse me, sorry, David was already in Kodiak. I flew in with Art, Brock, and Seth. I believe that was it for us. We flew in, I don't know, it was early morning. We went straight to the boat, and the boat was tied up in the harbor. There was already pots on the boat. We put our bags on. Gary hadn't quite got there yet. I believe he was on a later flight that day.

So we were just cleaning some stuff up. There was a big mess on the deck, as, as far as I recall. It was steel everywhere from a project they had worked on, which you had noted earlier in this — these hearings. Paint stuff scattered throughout the deck. You know, it was just kind of clean up the — whatever had happened while the offhand (ph.) was happening and then stand by and wait for Gary to get there. Gary showed up soon thereafter. Then we had to move the boat over to the Trident dock so we could load our gear and rig pots.

But it took probably the better part of three, four hours to 1 2 move the boat because the, the lines we were using weren't the, the regular Samson line, you know, the, the newer aged stuff. It 3 was the three braid, pretty hard laid stuff, and it had been froze 4 over from being -- the boat sitting there for the last -- I don't 5 know, I don't know when they laid the boat up, but it took quite 6 some time of putting water on the lines, beating it with, you know, our ice hammers trying to get the, the boat cut loose. 8 that was quite an extensive task.

Then we moved over to the Trident dock, and it was just boogey on gear. You know, putting triggers in for cod. They were re-web pots, so they weren't ready at all. We had to start doing that. And the first day, that's all we did for probably 18-plus hours working on that.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. And I'm sorry if I missed it, so where, where was the vessel when you first got onboard? I see -- you said you moved to Trident, but where was it when you got onboard?
- A. I don't know Kodiak that well because I haven't fished a lot of out of there, but I believe it's Dog Bay is what it's called over there. It's across the bridge in town there.
- Q. Okay. And, and you also mentioned doing some cleanup work.

 Do you remember who assisted you in that cleanup work?
- A. It was kind of a mixed bag of us. We, we were all looking to staying busy, right. And if you're, you're leaning, you're cleaning. And, you know, a clean boat's a happy boat. So I think

everyone was trying to do their part there. And a lot of questions were being asked, by me, of course, because I'm fresh to the boat. I want to know like what's all this steel from and, and I got some answers out of Art, you know. General maintenance on the outside of the boat, getting ready to go, you know, put our — just getting down to the boat. You know, you want to put all your stuff away, too, so after we got the deck cleaned up, then staying busy putting our clothes away, getting ready for a couple month long season.

- Q. And so in, in regards to the steel that, that you cleaned up, do you recall what you guys did with the steel when you cleaned it up?
- So it was originally consolidated, like stacked because it 13 14 was just kind of scattered at first, stacked up by the launcher there until we moved. And then that steel was actually -- I don't 15 16 know if you actually went and got it, but I did put in my statement that when we were loading pots, you know, the, the 17 18 saying goes -- as a fisherman is we should probably float this out. So it's sitting in the harbor right there next to -- it's by 19 20 the dock right there.
- 21 Q. Okay. So if I understand --
- 22 A. It just went overboard.
- 23 Q. So the first -- but in the initial cleanup, it was stacked.
- 24 And then when you -- when transited over --
- 25 A. Yeah.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

-- to Trident it was dropped? Ο.

1

2

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- As, as we started stacking the boat out, you know, we were stacking from the, the front of the house forward, and then things started getting tight. And that one point everyone's like, we're 4 5 tripping -- we were tripping over this for however long. Now it's 6 time to do something with it. It's got to go somewhere so we 7 could stack more pots up.
 - Okay. And, and now -- so now the vessel's at Trident and you spent the day loading the pots, as you said. Can you tell us more about loading the pots and that time between loading all the pots and getting ready for departure?
 - You know, it was a slow go because it, it wasn't just like load pots, let's go. Like I said, you know, I, I wasn't really made aware of all this -- of all, all the work that really needed to be done on all these pots. So we were, you know, tying shots of line. It's pretty basic still, but to the extent we were rigging over all the pots to do cod like triggers in all of them. So, you know, we have a loader.

We'd stack 15, 20 pots by the boat, and then we'd sit there and zip tie the triggers in, you know, pretty basic stuff, and then swing those over, and then we'd get another 15. So it was a -- definite process, you know. Tedious, took quite some time to actually load the whole boat up. I don't think the boat was actually -- I think it was after Dean finally showed up that we finally got the last of the pots loaded.

- Q. And just for clarity for -- to, to help educate us, so you said the -- loading the triggers into the pot, can you describe what those are and, and, and how they're inserted into the pots?
 - A. What, what, the, the triggers?
 - Q. The triggers.

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

CDR DENNY: The triggers.

THE WITNESS: Oh, the, the triggers are basically -- it's a way for the fish, cod fish to actually swim in and (indiscernible) their face like this. So the cod will come into that final pattern there when they open up. And as soon as they're in the pot, they close back down and the cod can't get back out. It's a fight to get back up.

BY CAPT CALLAGHAN:

- Q. Okay. Thank you. So it's, it's something that's put in just for cod fishing or --
- 16 A. Yeah.
- 17 | Q. -- is it left in all --
- A. Unless you're 100 percent full time cod boat, they get pulled out and put in. If, if you don't have a gear there -- and there are some boats that have enough gear where they have their cod
- 21 gear set aside and then their (indiscernible) gear.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. And as far as loading all the pots, do you remember how many pots were loaded?
- A. No, I kept asking Art how many we were putting on because it had gotten a little out of hand where I was like thinking we had a

little too many on, but I'm hired from here down. Not there to ask a lot of questions about that. And not being on the boat ever, you know, what's not normal to me might be normal to someone that worked on there (indiscernible), you know what I mean? So I would have to look at -- I think there's some pictures on it, but, but if I looked at it, I was a -- they swung pretty much every pot on there. And I can give you a pretty close number, and I think it was pushing up over 200 a little ways.

2.5

- Q. Okay. Thank you. And so can you -- and it -- and in terms of how the pots were being stacked, can you describe for us when the pots were placed on boat and what configuration they were being stacked in?
- A. So basically any space on deck was filled, you know, and that's actually -- to, to go back to what you asked me about the other aft house boat I worked on, this was different to me because once you stack this boat out, there's no alleyway. And like, on the Wizard, for instance, they have a way to actually come in to the gear room into the house. This boat, once you stacked it out, you had to climb up over the stack to even get back to the house. There was no, you know, pass through.

So every -- from port to starboard, every spot was filled there. And then we would be four high -- I believe it was four high port side all the way to the starboard side, but on the starboard side, they were only three high. And that would be enough of a visual for whoever was operating the boat could

actually see out the wheelhouse window to see, you know, what was ahead. There was -- we also stacked them under the shelter deck.

You know, we'd have to push -- because we pushed them under there, stack them out under there. I mean, literally like every square inch of that deck was full of pots. And then we would put them on top of the wave wall -- or not wave wall, sorry, on top of the shelter deck, four high on there and then wrapped in an L shape up towards the, the tree up front there.

- Q. And two, two follow-up questions before I, I move on from this line. So for that stack that's up above on top of that, that foredeck there, in comparison to your previous work on similar vessel, is -- was that a normal configuration, to add those pots, extra pots up on that forward deck area?
- A. I, I had seen that before. Personally, I mean, I hadn't done it before personally, but I'd definitely seen it done before.
 - Q. Okay. Lieutenant McPhillips, can you pull up Exhibit 093 please? And can you just -- so you referred to alleyways before. So this is not a picture of -- from the *Scandies Rose* itself, but in terms of an alley within a stack, is this what you were
- 21 A. Yeah, yes, sir.

referring to?

2.5

Q. And so the difference between this and what the configuration that you loaded on the *Scandies*, am I correct in saying that the difference would be that that in the middle there would be another pot stacked vertically?

1 Yes. Yes, sir.

4

- 2 Okay. Thank you, Lieutenant McPhillips. You can bring that 3 down. Okay. And as far as the stacks, how are the stacks secured?
- 5 Oh, we used pot ties, standard. Everything's tied with pot 6 ties. And then, you know, you have your, your ties that are for (indiscernible) and then port and starboard. So pitch and roll. And then after that's all tied up like that, we put the 8 chains on them and we chained every rope before we left.
- 10 And once, once you had the, the pots stacked up, the -- what was the -- what, what kind of -- what role did you have after the 11 12 pots were stacked up and, and what took place onboard between the time you had the pots all stacked up and then --13
- 14 Α. Well --

2.5

- 15 -- prior to departure?
- 16 Well, the -- after -- of course, after we get the pots 17 stacked, you know, we're, we're coming up and then we got the 18 table. So then the table goes up on top as well, our sorting table. And that goes on top of the whole stack. And then this 19 20 was a little goofy to me, but we took bait after we had stacked 21 the whole boat up and just barely enough room to sneak a pallet of bait down in -- by the launcher there and we loaded bait after 22 23 That was our next task, loading bait. And we took about 24 15,000 pounds of bait that night.
 - Okay. So you mentioned the sorting table loading on top of Q.

- 1 the stack. So in, in reference to the, the stack itself, where -can you tell us where on, on the stack had --2
- Forward of the house. And, and the reason for that is, you know, you start setting gear, and then you work your way back kind 5 of -- you start by making yourself a little work area at that 6 point. You know, you make some room for -- things are a little tight at first when you start to -- initially start setting. you work your way back, and once you stair-step back, you pull the 8 table off and put it on deck and secure it on deck.
 - Okay. And, and was that normal from other configurations you've seen to load the, the sorting table on top --
- It's whatever --12 Α.
- 13 -- pot stack? Ο.

4

10

11

21

22

2.5

- 14 -- floats your boat. Some, some will put it on top. 15 will put it -- I've seen it on top of the wheelhouse itself. I've 16 seen it on the, the shelter deck. But -- yeah, well -- and I've 17 also seen it under the shelter deck was what I worked on actually 18 would push it back and have it under the shelter deck right there. Q. Lieutenant McPhillips, can you bring up Exhibit 014 please? 19
 - Well, this is just a series of photos of the Scandies Rose. So in, in terms of where the, where the sorting table is located on here, can you identify it in this picture at all?
- 23 Yes, and that (indiscernible) wheelhouse, like I was saying. I can see it right now on top of that (indiscernible) here. 24
 - Ο. So once that --

- 1 A. About -- it's about seven windows over.
- 2 Q. And once that's, once that's loaded, is there any obstruction
- 3 be -- from there to the forward end of the stack from the bridge?
 - A. What, what do you, what do you mean by that? Sorry.
 - Q. So looking from the wheelhouse, does that -- does having that
- 6 sorting --

5

- 7 A. Obstruct view?
- $8 \mid Q$. -- table there obstruct the view of the forward end of --
- 9 A. It would.
- 10 | 0. -- the stack?
- 11 A. Yeah.
- 12 Q. Okay. So now that the, the stack is secured, can you tell us
- 13 what else took place onboard before getting underway?
- 14 A. Like I said, bait -- we loaded bait. They were throwing a
- 15 | chain on every row. And we were standing by and just kind of
- 16 waiting. You know, trying to make my memory serve me correctly,
- 17 but, you know, we waited for a little while. I think someone
- 18 brought some pizza down. We looked -- it was such a boat show.
- 19 don't want to use, I don't want to use the S word, but if you
- 20 | follow me there, that we were -- food was coming on, pots were
- 21 coming on. There wasn't like a method of the madness. It was
- 22 | just pretty much madness. You know, we got to go. Time to go.
- 23 So anything we could do, everything was just swinging on.
- 24 (Indiscernible) some food and then pots and then food and then
- 25 pots and more pots and then bait, you know, after we were done

with the pots.

2

3

4

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- Q. And, and so in terms of bait, where was the bait being loaded?
 - A. Up forward, in the forward freezer there.

Trident dock, so they brought it around to us.

that the -- to get underway?

- 5 Q. And do you recall how much bait was taken onboard?
- A. 15,000 pounds is what we took from the cannery there. And I believe it actually came to 15 from the *Ocean Beauty*, I believe, and was brought around with the forklifts to -- we were at the
- Q. Okay. And in terms of -- you said, you said things were kind of -- seemed to be in a rush to, to keep going. Any explanation of why it -- things, things might be hurried? Was there -- from, from that point, was there an understood schedule or timeframe
 - A. Well, I knew we were going to fish cod, January 1, right, but it was just a little, a little -- it was a little off to me just because, you know, generally doing gear work, getting stuff ready to go, you know, the sun goes down and, and we don't have any lights out there and hard to see. It's almost like counterproductive to try and keep tying triggers. And when you're off in the shadows, you can't see anything. I got a headlamp on, but definitely not as productive. So there was a few days there getting ready that we went over 20 hours in just doing gear work, which was not normal to me, at least on any boat I've ever worked on. You know, usually the guys kind of sit down and have some

dinner and BS for a little bit.

But, you know, at that time, I just thought, you know, we need to get out of town. We're ready to get out of town. And I, I didn't really put it together until, of course, after this all happened, why, why we were in a hurry to leave so fast. And, you know, the thing that came up to me was the prior year, all, all the over 60 -- all over -- the over -- 60 and over boats that were fishing last year or the year prior to this, their season closed on the 6th of January. They only had enough time to get their gear out, in the water, barely make a trip, and then they had to stack out again and go to town. So by schedule, leaving on the 30th, you know, we got some days of travel. And by the time we even get our gear in the water, that's if we don't have any weather (indiscernible), we might not even make a trip. You know, it seems like it's possible.

- Q. Okay. And, Lieutenant McPhillips, can you pull up Exhibit 014 again, please, and put up page 19? Mr. Lawler, does this picture look familiar at all?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. And --
- A. That -- in fact, in fact, to reiterate, I had my headlamp on because we were rigging pots still.
- || Q. And so is that --
- 24 A. It took all night.
- 25 Q. Is that --

- 1 A. What's that?
- 2 Q. -- you in the picture?
 - A. Yes, sir.

2.5

- Q. And, Lieutenant McPhillips, can you scroll up to page 18
 please? Mr. Lawler, can you tell us where this -- kind of give us
 some sense of reference for where this picture was taken and, and
 kind of what we're looking at here in this?
 - A. Okay. So my right hand is -- if I can see it. Yeah, my right hand is facing toward the bow. Those pots there on my right hand there are up against the tree there. On my left, those are the pots that head back to the superstructure. And so where my head is is the, the shelter deck. The pots are stacked on the shelter deck there, so that goes right down, and below that shelter deck, on my right hand side, the shelter down, that goes into the forepeak there where all the bait is stored as well.
 - Q. So, Mr. Lawler, there, there is a laser pointer up there if it would make it easier to kind of highlight the areas, but so, understanding that your right arm is then on the forward, forward side of the stacks and your, your left hand being on the aft side of the stacks, is that correct?
 - A. Yeah, and on the, the right side there, those don't -- that doesn't go all the way down to the deck. That just stops on the, on the shelter -- under the shelter deck right there. That's actually (indiscernible) right here and then comes across the beam of the boat.

- Q. And, and what other access point do you have to get to that area where you are?
 - A. That's it. And that, that was the -- I mean, every boat has their own way, but that was the goofiest thing to me, having to -- you know, something goes bad, which we didn't have to deal with that aspect of it, but I just thought in the back of my head, how do you get back and forth into the house? You know, there's no, no, no real access. Yes, to answer your question, yes, that's how you go to the wheelhouse. You got to climb up and over.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. And, Mr. McPhillips, can you go to page 20 of the same exhibit please? And so this is a -- this shows kind of a picture of, of some of the pots and the mechanisms to secure.

 Does this look accurate or -- and, and how would you describe this in comparison to others as far as how the -- how, how well the pots may have been secured compared to your other experiences?
 - A. I mean, that's pretty standard. So you got obviously a chain that runs through it. And then right here is your chain binder.

 And then right here, there's a pot tie on that chain binder to keep the handle of the chain binder from kicking loose and letting slack on that chain.
- Q. Okay. And then, Lieutenant McPhillips, could you just -page 2, please, on the same exhibit. So, Mr. Lawler, does this
 picture look like an, an accurate representation of the time the
 vessel was loading there --
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. -- prior to the voyage? And if, if you would, if you could use the laser pointer and, and I can barely make it out, but if you can make out the sorting table on the back end of the stack,
- 4 can you highlight that for us please?
- 5 A. I can.
- 6 Q. Great. Okay. Thank you. Lieutenant McPhillips, you can 7 pull that down please. And were all the pots the, the same pots?
- 8 A. So as far as I -- my recollection goes, there were some that
- 9 were eight-by-eights, and there were some that were eight-by-
- 10 sevens. And there was the -- I, I can't recall completely, but
- 11 there was a weird way that the deck had to go on. Because I
- 12 remember -- if I recall right, we had a few that were just
- 13 oddballs that had to be on the deck and then ones that would stack
- 14 | them all together up on top the stack.
- 15 Q. Do you recall --
- 16 A. And you can have an off side, you know, an offshoot side.
- 17 | You want to have a flat top, you know, your whole deck's stacked
- 18 that way. Everything stacks up on top without hanging out, so --
- 19 Q. Okay. Do you recall if any of the pots were weighed prior to
- 20 | loading?
- 21 A. Not there, no, sir.
- 22 Q. Okay. And, at any times have there been any discussion about
- 23 | tarping the pots on the *Scandies Rose* at all?
- 24 A. About, about what now?
- 25 Q. About tarping the pots on the Scandies Rose?

A. Yeah, actually there was. So the boat that I referenced earlier that I had the opportunity to go on and I had to turn that down due to already committing to Gary, I have a friend that was on there, and he sent me a picture. They were over in King Cove the day that we were leaving, and they had tarped their whole stack off. And I showed that to Gary in the wheelhouse, and he was like -- I can't remember his exact words he used. It's not -- we don't need that, you know, blah, blah, blah. I was like, all right. I'm just showing you what they're dealing with over in King Cove at the time, you know, heavy freezing spray over there. And at the same time, we heard the forecast on the radio too. But we never -- just opted not to, I guess. So --

2.5

Q. And you -- so you referenced the forecast you heard on the radio. And, and what kind of forecast were you hearing at that time?

A. I, I couldn't quote it verbatim, but it was enough of a shitty forecast to -- I didn't think we were going to leave that night. You know, I was waiting for the call, you know. We had been working our asses off getting the boat ready, and then we heard the weather forecast, and I'm thinking, oh, we're -- the boys are going to have a bar night. We're going to go into town and get some beers because we're definitely not leaving in that.

And, you know, we waited I think it was six -- no, six, seven -- it was a few hours just to wait on the tide to go out Whale's Pass instead to have a little cover on the way out. And, you

- know, and the, the words, I still remember them, were we're going
 to run into some shit, and that's shit's be -- going to become a
 lot of shit. But make sure everything's tied down good. That was
- 5 Q. And to -- at, at any point was there any discussion, any 6 further discussion on the weather about any -- potentially
- 7 delaying departure for the weather?
- 8 A. (No audible response.)
- 9 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't, I didn't catch that.
- 10 | A. No, sir.

it.

4

- Q. Okay. And had there been any concern expressed by any of the crew members regarding the weather leading up to getting underway?
- 13 A. I mean, it was always jokes until something bad happens,
- 14 right. So always going to joke, like, oh, it's going to be nasty
- out. Just prepare, boys. It's always funny until something
- 16 | happens.
- 17 Q. Is it, is it different -- so would you say that approach, was
- 18 that any different than any other experiences you've had on a
- 19 fishing vessel or is it kind of a similar attitude towards the
- 20 weather?
- 21 A. No. If I put it this way, you know, I've had people ask me,
- 22 why didn't you say something, like, you know, suggest that maybe
- 23 we shouldn't leave, you know? And I, I always laugh about that.
- 24 | I'm like, that's not what you're hired for. You're hired as, you
- 25 know, like I said, from the neck down. And you get that

reputation as being that guy that didn't have, you know, the, the balls, if you will, I guess, to go. That sticks with you, and good luck getting a job on another boat. So no one's, no one's ever brought that up. You don't, you don't do that.

2.5

- Q. Okay. So with regards to further procedures before getting underway, were any -- was the crew brought together at any point prior to getting underway as, as a whole crew?
- A. Yeah, so since -- we were waiting on the weather for -- not waiting on the weather. If we were waiting on the weather, we would have waited a couple days, but since we were waiting on tide throughout Whale Pass instead of being exposed completely on the first little part of our departure, we utilized that time to do -- to run through all the safety equipment. And that was, you know, a little while before we departed.
- Q. And so can you take us through that, what safety equipment you ran through and to what extent?
 - A. We got survival suits out. Gary had Dean put one on. Sorry. We did -- we made a mock mayday call. He had David do that, and it was kind of a -- then he had me do it because it wasn't being done the way he wanted it to be done, so I did it for him. And then went outside, looked at the (indiscernible), looked at the rafts. It was just an eerie night. There's, there's all sorts of like superstitious things that we have for this, but like even one -- that, that key point there where we were going through the safety drills, you know, Gary made this comment about how you

- don't leave the boat, the boat leaves you. And there's just all these like references to like bad news. And I knew we were leaving into a storm, and it just didn't feel right. Nothing, nothing about it felt right.
- Q. So to follow up on regards to -- so through you -- going through the safety items, would you refer to that as safety drills that are normal, standard procedures?
 - A. As far as like EPIRB and like rafts, yeah, generally speaking, yeah. And, you know, I, I think, for me, I've been around the industry long enough to where I make myself familiar to, you know, be proactively like know where things are because you never know when something's going to happen. But there's been boats that were kind of -- where it's just kind of that's there, that's there. But since we had time, we really went into depth about like going and looking at everything. So we were waiting on the tide, like I said.
 - Q. And so, during the drills, you had mentioned that you had taken the immersion suits out and that Captain Cobban had had Mr. Gribble put one on. Did anyone else on the crew don an immersion suit during those drills?
- 21 A. No, sir.

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. So, in your previous experience, is that standard practice during the drills for different crew members to, to put it on? Is it usually all crew members or just a random selection?
- 25 A. Usually, like, if someone does put one on, generally it's the

new guy that just showed up, you know, end of the season. But I guess I always assumed that, whatever, being the new guy on the boat sometimes -- well, I mean, I was new there too, but I didn't put one on. But new -- yeah, usually I, I don't think -- I can't even count on one hand how many times I've been in a wheelhouse where the whole crew puts them on as the training precisely.

Q. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

- And then to go back to the EPIRB, that's for your 8 9 (indiscernible), we did bring the EPIRB into the wheelhouse, and this is a thing I do remember which is Gary hit the button on it, and he -- I remember, he's like, whoops, I shouldn't have done 11 12 that, because I'll call you guys on accident. But I never saw the lights flash on when it happened. We were in a dark wheelhouse. 13 14 I mean, it may or may not have, but I just always -- it sears in 15 my brain, like maybe that thing was bad when we left, and maybe 16 that's why it didn't go off.
- Q. Okay. And did you happen to witness Captain Cobban after testing the EPIRB there, what do you -- what --
- 19 A. Well, it was --
- 20 0. -- you did with the EPIRB after?
- A. Like he didn't mean to, and he thought he did, but I didn't see any indication that it ever started sending out a signal. And then it just went right back to the, the home on the stern there.
- Q. Okay. So with regards to its home, can you describe to us where, where the EPIRB was located?

- 1 A. Yeah, it was, it was on the stern on the, the handrail there 2 behind the starboard side, I believe.
 - Q. Okay. So --

14

15

16

- A. Down, down the stairs I believe it was. I'm trying to remember right, and so -- I only saw it that one quick moment, but I'm -- if my memory serves me correctly, it was, yeah, just, just behind the, the starboard side.
- 8 Q. Lieutenant McPhillips, can you bring up Exhibit 014, please, 9 page 9? So looking at this picture of the deck there --
- 10 A. That's on the port side there then, so I, I was off on that.
 11 You can see it right there.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. And is, and is that the area that, that you recall it --
 - A. Now, now, yeah, but like I said, I only saw it for a split second that night, so -- now that you brought that picture up, it flashes back in my head now.
- Q. Okay. So from the time you guys ran the drills, if we can ask -- if I can ask you just kind of take us through kind of the conversations, the, the attitude of the crew on -- you know, during that time and then kind of, you know, in perhaps leading up to getting underway?
- A. You mean just how everyone was the whole time loading the boat and everything? I mean, like I said, I didn't know everyone that well, so it was a different -- we were starting to get know every -- you know, each other. And Art spent a lot of time going

in and out of the engine room doing his kind of thing and flooding tanks, checking oil. Brock was constantly welding on pots, so he's just kind of welding, welding. He was fixing, welding pots all the time. So it was pretty much just myself, Seth, Dillon Gamby and -- yeah, the three of us, yeah, and David rigging pots the whole time.

There was no animosity amongst anybody. Everyone got along good. Actually, at one point, I think I told (indiscernible) I felt like everyone was jiving really well together and looking forward to the season. You know, it was -- you, you get on some boats where people are just butting heads all the time and just not a fun season. You got to get through it. And this, this, this was different. It was easy to, to mesh.

- Q. Okay. So now that things are prepped and you guys are set to get underway, can you tell us approximately what time you guys departed and, and who might have been on the bridge and kind of take us through the watch vigil from that point?
- A. Well, everyone (indiscernible) about the crew, so Dean wasn't there yet when I referenced that. It was Dillon Gamby. Dillon had quit -- yeah, I guess he had -- from what I heard, he told Gary he was getting to be old and he thought he was going to be, I guess, a risk to the rest of the crew for not having his head in the game. But then Art also told me that I was moving too fast, and he felt like he was not in his element.

I -- when we were loading pots, I had -- he was giving me the

signal to go down one day, and I couldn't see him over there, and I went down and knocked him on his head. And I could see him, you know, it, it hurt him, but I could barely see him because I just caught it, and I stopped, and I just told him, I go, what are you doing? You know, you, you know, you told me to go down. I can't see you over there. He, he knew it was his fault, and after that, he never came back to the boat. So I think that was kind of his reasoning there from what I gathered. And then Dean came on the boat. So now we're back to where the crew actually is now. So Dillon did not go with us, just to make that clear.

2.5

- Q. Okay. Thank you. So now can you take us through kind of the steps getting underway and kind of the watch schedule once you -- you know, for departure?
- A. So I untied the bow with Brock. I think Dean was up there with us, I'm pretty sure. I can't remember that one though. And a few other guys untied the stern, bailed out of the dock, started heading out the channel. And then Brock and I turned the bow heater on to get that going. Or actually, no, we, we told Art to turn it on, and he turned it on. We made sure it was actually putting out heat to melt the snow off that was on the deck up there. Stowed our lines, dogged the door, made sure that everything was watertight up front and secure, never made it back to the stern. And yeah, we rounded the corner, and we honked the horn at a house on the way out. Here we go. We're, we're going crabbing or we're going cod fishing first, unfortunately, but

- l going crabbing after that.
- 2 Q. Okay. And, and so who had -- who took the first, who took
- 3 the first watch after departure?
 - A. (Indiscernible).
- 5 0. What was that?

- 6 A. I, I don't know if I can -- I'd, I'd be -- I wouldn't be
- 7 giving you an accurate answer if I told you that right now because
- 8 I, I would be a -- just throwing the dice on that. I don't know
- 9 who started first.
- 10 Q. Okay. Do you remember --
- 11 A. Well, I mean, Gary took us out a ways until we got a course
- 12 made, of course.
- 13 Q. Do you remember what timeframes that you stood watch
- 14 | throughout the voyage?
- 15 A. Yeah, I can't remember all the times, no. I know we were
- 16 taking an hour a piece for a while there.
- 17 Q. Do you remember who you would take the watch from or who
- 18 | would --
- 19 A. I would take it from David, and then I would pass it to Dean,
- 20 and Dean would pass it to Gary.
- 21 \ Q. And do you recall how many watches you had stood during the
- 22 | transit?
- 23 A. I believe two or three. Three. I think three.
- 24 Q. And can you take us through kind of, kind of your -- the
- 25 operation? So once you're underway, kind of making your way out,

you know, your observations from that point?

A. I mean, everything was running smooth it seemed like. Then it was taking my watch, listening to the radio, channel 16 for you folks and put the weather channel once in a while. It's just the way I just do it. I, I own and operate a (indiscernible) of A boats. I'm always curious about the weather as a boat owner also. And just paying attention to the radar, making sure there's no ships out there. It was pretty basic because I -- it's just what I've been doing for however many years now.

You know, at, at one point, we had a little bit of the list out, out of the gate, but I just chalked that up to, to, you know, needing to transfer some fuel. And I think, on my next watch, I actually think I put that in my statement on the, on the next watch it had — was no longer there. And I, I believe Art transferred some fuel. It wasn't enough to be concerned about though. I figured he was downstairs doing his thing. But like I said, running boats before, I always have that in the back of my head. A little bit of list, what's going on? Making sure, you know, you want to be trim. It's a lot safer that way.

- Q. And when you took over from David, any -- anything pass from David to you in taking over the watch?
 - A. So, so the first bit wasn't bad because, you know, I mean, it was definitely shitty out, but we, we had a little bit of, of cover still. So that first watch, there was no ice accumulation at all, no nothing. And I'm -- I said two or three watches, so

that might have been my second night, it was still okay. And on my third was when I noticed a little bit of ice buildup, but nothing I would ever be concerned about.

Q. Okay.

2.5

- A. It's like, I remember my comment to Dean when he took his watch was I looked at the chains because it -- there was a little bit on the bow, like on the crab pots, which is pretty controlled, but likes to gather right there. And the crab pots are not really anything, you know, a little sprinkle. But then the chains have enough ice that it kind of was dropping them, and I was telling Dean, you know, that's going to be a pain in the ass to get those off later because it's pulling against every time you get some slack on the line or it's just going to take it out again.
- Q. Okay. Had, had you had any conversations with Captain Cobban between the time -- you know, during that your, your watch is or, you know, during that transit time?
- A. No, the only time I really talked to Captain Cobban, honestly, from the time we left until the time everything went bad was he asked me in the wheelhouse before we left if I had ever sat in the seat hauling gear. And I said I hadn't on a boat that size. And he showed interest that maybe I could take over for while he like if he wanted to keep a 24 hour rotation going or something, maybe I could sit up there, and I said I wouldn't be opposed to that. That's pretty much our only conversation we had after we left.

1 | Q. Okay.

- 2 A. Well, I mean, I -- we had words when everything just went 3 bad, but that's for later.
- Q. And, and as far as when you were on the bridge, was there any outlying expectations for what duties you should be -- or that were to be -- performed while you were on watch?
 - A. You mean as far as like if there was a problem, like to wake someone up or --
- 9 Q. Any -- yeah, any -- like were there particular times or expectations for making rounds or, you know, at what point to notify the captain?
 - A. I mean, yeah, if you're listing hard over or something, clearly you're going to, you know, wake the captain up. Or if you're accumulating a lot of ice, you know, what should we do about -- it's looking like it's getting a little bad or, you know, if the weather -- for me, personally, like I -- a lot of guys will wake the captain up. I don't much, like let the guy get his sleep. So a lot of times, guys will wake the captain up if the weather just starts coming from a different direction and you just got a shitty course and you want to turn into it a little bit to have it ride a little nicer.

I always took it upon myself to know where we're going, adjust a little bit. That way old cappy isn't getting tossed around in his bunk. You know, that's about it. I mean, a lot of guys will wake him up for that, but other than that, no. No real

expectations other than going to check on the engine room. That

-- and that's actually on most boats, and it was on this one too.

Every half hour, I'd take a walk downstairs and, you know, walk to

the engine room. Make sure, obviously, we're not taking water

through the packing or anything like that, or just anywhere, crab

pumps.

- Q. Okay. Mr. Lawler, I know we're at, at a scheduled break time. Are you good to take a few minute recess and then --
- 9 A. Yeah.

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- 10 0. -- come back and resume?
- 11 A. It's your show.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: So let's, let's go ahead and take a -- it says it's scheduled for 15. If you're okay, I'd like to kind of just make it a five-minute recess and, and then we'll get -- this way we can get some more valuable time from you following the recess. So the time now is 1515. This hearing will go into a five-minute recess and reconvene at 1520.

(Off the record at 3:15 p.m.)

(On the record at 3:21 p.m.)

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. The time is now 1521. This hearing is now back in session.

BY CAPT CALLAGHAN:

Q. Mr. Lawler, so I appreciate everything so far, and really just -- so, at this point, I've kind of asked a lot of questions to get -- kind of get us to the voyage itself. And, and now what

I'd like to do is ask you to kind of take us through your experience. Take us through your account of the events from the time the, the voyage began up until the mayday call. And I -- we'll -- I'll be happy to sit here and take notes as, as you kind of replay the events for us please.

- A. So, so starting from when now? Like from when we left the harbor?
- Q. Yes, please.

A. Okay. So it was the 30th. We took out of the harbor. Like I said, we honked the horn on the way out. We, we were all exhausted at this point. We'd been working three to four days just on gear work, sleeping a couple hours a day, not even fishing yet. And usually that's kind of something — stuff that you do when you're actually fishing. But excited to finally get some seas underway, if you will. It really wasn't a whole lot going on. A lot of movie watching, wheel watching, wheel watching, wheel watching, wheel watching, pretty standard. You know, there — really — uneventful up until it wasn't uneventful. I mean, when I was on watch, the waves were getting pretty big on my last watch, but the boat was just kind of crushing through them.

I guess I'll just fast forward because there was really nothing that particularly happen — happening on the boat. Everything seemed to be fine. I laid my bunk, I guess it would have been the night of the 31st of what it would have been, and picked a movie on. I remember, remember it like it's yesterday.

It was Ford v Ferrari, watching that movie. Dean actually gave it to me on his computer. But just sitting there watching a movie one night, and Dean comes in the room, hops up in his bunk, and he was laying there for a little bit, bull shitting. I'm just about to nod off and we, we were never like listing a little bit at all. It was trim. Good to go.

But then all the sudden, I rolled into my bunk, and just this sheer terror comes over me. Just I knew something was wrong. So I, I ran upstairs and I look at Gary and said what, what the fuck's going on? What's going on? And he goes, I don't know what's going on. I said, I think we're fucking sinking. No fucking shit we're sinking. Then I, then I look out the, the windows; they're iced over a little bit, but not a lot. And I'm just trying to figure out, how did it go from nothing to like the boat's literally like leaving us now. And I yelled out to Dean, I go, Dean, wake the fuck up, we're fucking sinking. And I can hear him down there yelling at me, what? We're fucking sinking.

So he comes running up the stairs, and it's just -- I, I don't know how to like tell you guys exactly. Just too much like adrenaline going on. I, I don't -- like it was just pumping. I -- the boat's rolling over. I'm trying to get the survival suit on. No general alarm was going off.

I'm trying to like get to this part, but -- could we break for a little bit please?

CAPT CALLAGHAN: The time is now 15 -- the time is now 1525.

This hearing's going to go into a short recess.

(Off the record at 3:25 p.m.)

(On the record at 3:32 p.m.)

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. The time is 1533. This hearing is back in session.

BY CAPT CALLAGHAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. So, Mr. Lawler, kind of got to the point where you had been woken up and, and run up to the bridge. So in the immediate moment when you got to the bridge, can you tell us who was up there when you got up there?
- 11 A. It was, it was just Gary. He was the only one up there.
- 12 I'll -- going backwards, you know, at first, I thought we were
- 13 turning around. That's what it felt like. I got up there, and it
- 14 was just Gary. He was on the sat phone, satellite phone with
- 15 somebody, because I heard he had just queued it. You know, it's
- 16 | an unmistakable sound. I mean, if you've been on a boat, you know
- 17 what a sat phone sounds like. He was the only one up there.
- 18 Q. And, and you said you, you, you mentioned waking up or, or
- 19 yelling down that -- to Dean at some point. Can, can you -- do
- 20 you remember how long, you know, how long it took for him to kind
- 21 of get up to the bridge?
- 22 A. Say that again.
- 23 Q. From the time you got up there until the time you notified
- 24 Mr. Gribble.
- 25 A. Oh, it was pretty much immediate. I mean, I looked at Gary

and I -- just that, that -- I don't know how to explain it to
anybody. Just that gut wrench that not -- this is not good. Like
this is -- there's no coming back from this. Like we are sinking
now. And I just kept yelling, just started yelling because
there's no alarm going off.

Q. And --

6

- A. Oh, Dean was up there within seconds like -- because it shocked him, too, because he felt the, the boat go too. But I think he kind of felt we were turning around too. But I -- just something clicked in my head that it wasn't right.
- Q. And was there any, was there any notification to the rest of the crew, or did the rest of the crew kind of get, get -- make their way to the bridge at any point?
- A. Can -- sorry. I'm, I'm having a hard time just concentrating right now.
- Q. For, for the rest of the crew, did the rest of the crew make it up to the bridge?
- 18 A. I don't remember.
- 19 Q. From --
- A. There was, there was people there. Like voices were there, but I always tell everything that it's compared to like a -- if you're familiar with the movie *Saving Private Ryan*, but when he was on the beach at Normandy, and there's a shell shock, and it's just, just white noise all around you. Just pure panic. It -- there were -- people were there. I couldn't tell you who was who,

was who.

Q. Okay. And, and you said you started putting on your immersion suit at some point?

A. Yeah, I got -- so when I got -- went to the box to get my -- I knew where the box was, but it was dark in the wheelhouse. And just -- I can't even -- to explain any of the feeling I had is next to impossible. Like the fumbling around, trying to find the latches on the box in the dark. But with the amount of adrenaline that was going threw me, like I was just panicking. I couldn't even get into the -- where, where the suits were kept. And finally it just opened for me. I had enough, you know, fumbling around in there. And I, I -- the only thing I do remember in that moment was the green suit's the big one, and I need to move fast. You know, I'm a big boy, too, but I just knew I could get to that one the quickest, so that's the first one I pulled out and just muscle, muscle memory. I, I don't, I don't know what it was. It was just fight or flight.

Q. And, and then what, what did, what did you do after that?

A. I got my suit on. I was trying to get the zipper. Everyone

-- the people, to be honest, I'm hearing, "oh God, oh God" over

and over and over again, you know, from other people around me.

No one was using their words. It was just sheer panic. Like

there were no conversations of, of anything. I think, at one

24 point, I did hear Gary say something about like, I don't know what

5 to do, and I heard someone say, you need to call the Coast Guard

now. And as I'm getting my suit on, there's people around me. I do remember looking up, and the throttles got pulled back on the boat, and then it just — it was downhill from there. The boat started going fast. Like fast. After we lost the, you know, forward momentum.

2.5

Q. And, and then once you had your suit on, can -- you know, what, what did you do right after you got your suit on?

A. I got out. And the one thing that's burnt in my brain and I can't get rid of is I stood over Mr. Rainey and was trying -- because it was -- the pitch of the boat was so steep that I was hanging on to things and could hear shit crashing off, off the shelves. And he grabs me by my suit and pulling on me and goes, help me, Johnny, help me. And I didn't help him. He wasn't even in his suit, he barely had his feet in, and I just knew I need to

leave the boat and I had to make the decision. I had to go.

And that's what I did. I went -- I got up to the port door barely, like climbing onto things, and went out. And just the wind hit my face, and I, I just kept telling myself in my head that there's -- got to get the suit on, got to get outside.

Because I -- there's a history, too, and I worked on a boat called the Destination (indiscernible) before, and I thought about those guys all the time. I used to always play this back in my head, how would I get out of a boat. You know, you can't get out of a boat when it's upside-down and the location -- you know, and your suit. So I just had to get out.

I got out, and I was outside, and I'm still trying to get my zipper up. I couldn't get my zipper up. The wind's just howling out there. There's ice all over the rails. And I just remember hearing Dean yell at me, Johnny. Like loud. I mean, I'm not -- I don't want to yell at you guys, so -- and I turn around, and he goes, what are we doing? And I don't know what we're doing.

We're going for a swim, that's all I can say. And I told him I couldn't get the zipper up, and he started freaking out, trying to help me. But they just -- I couldn't help him. There was not enough time to help anybody. Everybody had to help themselves because it -- everyone's -- everyone froze.

- Q. Can, can you tell us when, when you made it out the, the port door there, kind of what happened after you got out -- outside the door?
- 15 A. Well, I got out there and -- sorry.
- 16 Q. It's okay. Take your time.

A. Oh God. Honestly, I prayed. That's all I did. I just don't know what's going to happen. And when Dean finally did come out, he said, we should probably go up and try to get a raft started. There's no way we were getting up there. They're out of reach. I mean, not out of reach, but got hung up in the rigging. I'm just forward think -- trying to forward think, you know. I was just expecting to go in the water. That's all. And I was hoping people were going to follow me out.

The recollections I have outside, if that helps you at all,

no alarms going off, like I said. And that's why I know Gary made that mayday call after, after I was outside, because the alarm was going off on the back of that mayday call. And the alarm didn't start sounding, finally, until we listed hard enough over. So what my theory is is that the mains, you know, auxiliary, they lost engine oil pressure. Then they started running away. The stacks were blowing black smoke out. And then you just felt the whole boat shudder, and then the lights out, and all I could hear was the ocean crashing from this. And you could hear — you couldn't really hear anybody inside anymore, which was the eeriest thing.

Then they -- you know, a lot of people were up on the high side with me, but when the boat listed over, I think they all just slid right down the floor and smashed into the wall on the other side. I just, I just, I just don't understand why they just go out the same door. There was, there was an opportunity for everyone to get out. It doesn't make any sense. I mean, I, I -- it's been ingrained in my brain for the last -- over a year now. I sleep about it. I daydream about it. I playback over and over and over again, try and change it in my head, but I don't know. If you're going to ask me, I, I don't know.

- Q. Well, sir, and, and it -- and it's -- and that's fine. It -- so I guess once your -- once -- so you said you were outside. You can hear the sea and, and the wind.
- A. Say that again?

2.5

Q. Once you were out in, in the water, can you, can you tell us from the time you, you guys were outside and, and --

2.5

Ο.

- A. Oh, it was quick. From, from the time I left my bunk to the time I was in the water, I mean, I don't have -- had a watch on me, but I would have gauged ten minutes, we were in the water.
- Q. And, and once, once you were in the water, what happened, what happened next once you were in the water?
- A. Well, before we went in the water, we didn't know we were going in the water. And that's I reverted back to what I said prior, you know, don't leave the boat; the boat leaves you.

 Because there's been stories like that of you guys finding boats that are sitting there barely bobbing and no crew to be found. So I just stood on it as long as I could. I followed the boat around. Sat on the superstructure, crawled around to the port side, put my hand in one of the scuppers. And then, by then, the water was halfway up my shins towards my knees.

And I heard Dean say, here, here it comes. So I look up to the side, fucking wall of water just blew us off. And I had my ladder blown up -- upside-down like a washing machine. I couldn't breathe. I was sucking in seawater. And then finally I calmed, you know, I had to calm myself down. I table it somehow, calm myself down enough to where I could just loosen my body and just breathe, like try and catch any pass of air I could get. That's, that's all I have. I mean, I thought I was dead the whole time.

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

And it -- was there a point after that once you, once you

were in the water, could you tell us what happened once you were 2 in, once you were in the water and, and could, could you see the 3 boat?

- Yeah, finally, when I kind of got my bearings, I just remembered seeing the bow of the boat was up. And you could hear it too. I still hear it. It's just like you think something that big would -- it wouldn't just get tossed around that hard. I mean, we had water somewhere that -- it had to have been water somewhere because it went down so fast. I sat up for a second (indiscernible) steel. I remember it sounds so stupid, but it was like the movies, swim away from the boat, and I remember just looking at the boat, paddling backwards as hard as I could. Then one second, just like a rocket, just down. Gone. Nothing but silence, just me, the ocean -- I say the ocean like nicely; it was, it was very violent that night.
- 16 And can you tell us -- so from that point, can you tell us 17 what happened next with -- from that point on?
- With what now? 18 Α.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

20

- From that point on, can you tell us what happened next? 19
- I was just accepting -- accepted that I wasn't going home. mean, the fact that the raft showed up, I don't know what to think 21 about that. The raft -- yeah, the raft -- as you know, I heard 22 23 Dean yelling at me. I barely had enough room to like look over my 24 neck, and here he was sitting in a raft, and I just couldn't 2.5 believe it. All I could do was swim as hard as I could to it.

- Il's not very easy to swim in those suits, as you know. And I got
- 2 | in it. At that point, it was nice to know someone else was there.
- 3 Q. And were -- once you, once you were able to swim to the raft, 4 were you able to get in the raft?
- 5 A. Yeah, I got in the raft.
- 6 Q. Okay. And is -- were you -- so were you in the raft with
- 7 Mr. Gribble then?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
- 9 Q. And once you guys were in the raft, could you tell us what
- 10 | happened from the timeframe you -- when you guys got in the raft?
- 11 A. A lot of screaming still, like yelling out, hoping there
- 12 would be someone else. There was, there was nobody else. We knew
- 13 that. We wanted to believe, you know. It's just a waiting game
- 14 | at that point, hoping somebody was going to come.
- 15 Q. From -- do you, do you remember how, how -- you can recall,
- 16 you know, when, when you first had sign of any -- anyone -- any
- 17 | aircraft overheard or, or the Coast Guard in the area?
- 18 | A. Say that one more time? I couldn't --
- 19 Q. Can you recall when -- you know, how long it took before you
- 20 heard an aircraft or saw the helicopter overhead?
- 21 A. It seemed like an eternity, but, you know, time is not
- 22 something that really registers right when you're out there in
- 23 that type of hell. I -- we, we were able to get to a bag and, and
- 24 | get some flares out. I thought I'd, you know, wait a little bit.
- 25 | The EPIRB got to kick the signal off. I don't want to start

firing flares off yet. You know, we were able to fire, fire some flares off. It, it was a -- fired one off, two off, and then waited. Then three, four, and no one ever came. But the wind was so violent against that thing, I kept hearing -- I kept thinking I heard the chopper the whole time. It was just playing games with my head, the wind just beating that thing.

2.5

Every time there, there would be a -- a huge wave would roll through, I don't know how we didn't -- that thing didn't capsize multiple times. I think just the fact that all the water was lodged in the bottom of it acted as some sort of stability for it because it was not friendly. And we, we ran out of flares. We, we had a flashlight from there. And that's in the report. And then the light in our raft went out. And Dean, you know, we were talking to each other for a while, trying to keep spirits up, you know. We're going to be okay. We're going to -- we knew we weren't going to be okay.

And then I'll never forget that moment when Dean just kind of stopped talking. And I kept checking him, are you all right? Are you doing okay? And I wasn't okay, but I just want to make sure he's okay. And I think now, looking back on it, I didn't realize how many hours we were out there, but becoming hypothermic, I guess that's kind of what happens to you. You stop being talkative, get ready for the long nap.

And then we had our eyes on the other raft, the other -- the (indiscernible) deployed two. I kept poking my head up there just

looking for some sort of life, wondering, you know. It feels like we've been out here forever. We have, but nothing. And then, on one of my times looking out, I, I saw a light over by that raft, and I thought it was another vessel. And I kept telling Dean, Dean, I think I see something. I think I see something. There's someone here. I swear there's someone here. Oh God, are you sure, you sure? And then that light went from right about water level and just shot up.

And next thing I knew there was a helicopter that came flying out. You know, I was, I was shining my flashlight at it the whole time, hoping that, you know, someone was going to see it. And we didn't have a light in our canopy. And they must have saw the light, because after they shot up, they were hovering over us, and that's the most beautiful sound I've ever heard in my life, the rotors on that copter, just the water spray coming out. I mean, I, I wish I had -- I'm not a good story teller, and I have to reiterate the story.

- 18 Q. Now -- and, and I appreciate what you -- what, what you've 19 been able to recall for --
- 20 A. If you need more detail --
- 21 Q. -- us, sir.

- 22 | A. -- I can try and give it to you.
- Q. I, I think what I'd like to do now is -- so now that we've established -- we've got to the point where the, the helicopter showed up, I'd like to take a five-minute recess, if that's okay

with you, and then come back and we can kind of do some follow-on questions for you. That -- if that works for you?

A. Yeah.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. The time is 1554. We're going to take a six-minute recess, and we'll resume at 1600.

(Off the record at 3:54 p.m.)

(On the record at 4:02 p.m.)

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. The time is now 1602, and this hearing is now back in session.

BY CAPT CALLAGHAN:

- Q. Mr. Lawler, I want to thank you for taking the time to, to get us through, get us through that. I know how difficult that must be and certainly appreciate your time in, in highlighting and, and bringing, bringing us through your experience. I have a couple of questions I want to follow on related to that experience and I'm -- it's going to kind of go back to just before you got on your way. Was there any testing of the bilge or other high water alarms before you got on your way that you witnessed?
- 19 A. No.
- Q. And when you arrived to the vessel, did you, did you bring any of your own survival equipment at all?
- 22 A. No, negative, sir.
- Q. And, Lieutenant McPhillips, can you bring up Exhibit 4,
 please, page 19? Sir, while that's coming up, so what I'm looking
 to try and do is just kind of establish the location of your

- 1 stateroom in, in relation to the bridge.
- 2 A. Top, top left right there.
 - Q. The top left?
- 4 A. Yeah.

- Q. And can you tell us, so where about -- what deck and, and where that stateroom's --
- A. That's the mid -- mid-deck. If you're, if you're heading up the, the wheelhouse stairs, you take an immediate right. And when you do, there's a (indiscernible) right in front of you and then rooms to the right of you.
- Q. Okay. Lieutenant McPhillips, can you scroll to page 18 please? Looking at that picture up in the top right, does that resemble that aft door of the stateroom?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Lawler. And thank you, Lieutenant
- 16 McPhillips. You can bring that down. And then, Lieutenant
- 17 McPhillips, I'm sorry, if you can bring back -- Exhibit 4 again,
- 18 page 9. And, sir, sir, the bottom picture there, there appears to
- 19 be some immersion suits in the cabinet there. Can you tell us
- 20 where that's located?
- 21 A. That's in the wheelhouse towards the port side.
- 22 Q. And do you recall how many immersion suits were stored in
- 23 | that location?
- 24 A. It was too dark to see.
- 25 Q. During the, the drills prior to getting underway, had the

- 1 immersion suits been in there? Were they put out of that location 2 or --
- 3 A. Just -- yeah, and this one was pulled on, the one that 4 (indiscernible).
- 5 Q. Okay.
- 6 A. Done.
- Q. And then, Lieutenant McPhillips, can you take us to Exhibit 8 103 please? So, Mr. Lawler, so for reference purposes, I want to
- 9 establish, does this immersion suit look familiar to you?
- 10 A. That's my suit, sir.
- 11 Q. Okay. And can you scroll down? Keep going down. Sorry.
- 12 And, Mr. Lawler, is that you in that suit there?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. Okay. Thank you. Okay. You -- I'm finished with that
- 15 exhibit, Mr. McPhillips. Thank you So, Mr. Lawler --
- 16 A. Sorry.
- 17 Q. As far -- so from the time you starting observing icing -- so
- 18 on, on your last watch, had you observed any ice buildup at that
- 19 time on your last watch?
- 20 A. Just the -- like I said, a little bit on the chains and then
- 21 on the crab pot (indiscernible).
- 22 Q. Are you aware of any discussions for -- at, at any point for
- 23 anyone to go out and, and break ice at any point?
- 24 A. There was never a discussion about that.
- 25 | Q. Okay.

3

5

4

6

7

8

9

1112

1314

1516

17

18 19

Α.

Α.

No.

Negative.

20

21 | 22 |

23

25

24

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Sir, I, I truly appreciate your time, and to, to make the best use of time, I'd like to offer this time and turn over my colleagues at the National Transportation Safety Board, Mr. Bart Barnum, to ask some follow on questions.

Mr. Barnum?

MR. BARNUM: Thank you, Captain.

BY MR. BARNUM:

Q. And I'm going to echo Captain's appreciate, you know, you showing up today and talking to us, Mr. Lawler. Thank you very much. I do have just a few follow-on questions. Prior to departure, was there ever any talk of taking less pots because the weather was forecasted to be foul?

- A. No, the only discussion about pots was that -- between my -- myself and Art when I was asking him how many we were loading, because we just kept putting them on, and it seemed like we were good already. But then again, you know, I, I never worked on the boat, so standard practice on the boat, I do not know.
- Q. Okay. So there was no -- in reference to the weather and --
- Q. -- and, and taking less --
- g. and taking less
- Q. Leading up to the, the accident location and the, the journey while you were standing your watches or -- and your crewmates were also standing watches, did you maintain a steady speed or was there -- did you reduce speed to lessen the effects of the weather

- 1 on the vessel?
- 2 A. I'm 99 percent positive the RPMs on the boat were the same
- 3 the whole time. You know, our speed, obviously, was lessened due
- 4 | to us going into it, but it was clear quartering it a lot of the
- 5 times, but --
- 6 Q. Right. Thank you. Yes, that's what I meant, if you manually
- 7 reduced them.
- 8 A. We were trying to maintain, but --
- 9 Q. Okay.
- 10 A. -- the tide and everything else was all (indiscernible).
- 11 Q. You mentioned in the beginning of your testimony that you
- 12 turned on the bow heater prior to leaving Kodiak. Did that stay
- 13 on the entire journey?
- 14 A. As far as I'm -- I, I wouldn't see why we would have shut it
- 15 off, especially with the forecast. But as far as my knowledge
- 16 goes, it was, it was never shut off.
- 17 Q. Okay. Also during your wheel watches, you mentioned you did
- 18 | a route of the engine room every half hour. Who was on the bridge
- 19 when you went down to do that?
- 20 A. Autopilot. That's how, how we usually practiced that.
- 21 | Q. Right. During those rounds of the engine room, did you note
- 22 any -- note anything out of the ordinary?
- 23 A. There was just one thing, and I'm only going to offer this
- 24 | just because I feel like it's something that they did, did in the
- 25 (indiscernible). You know, I, I told you how fast the boat went

- 1 down. And there's one thing I can add to that, too, even if we're
- 2 | taking water. And one of the things I did notice on this boat,
- 3 | that the watertight door that separates one part of the engine
- 4 room to the next, where those voids were, was always stuck open.
- 5 | It was never dogged shut. And that's just -- I think -- actually
- 6 asked Art about that, and he said they always leave it open. That
- 7 could have probably bought us some time, too, just to have them
- 8 dogged.
- 9 Q. Okay.
- 10 A. In the downward flooding.
- 11 Q. Understood. Do you recall which side of the vessel that
- 12 hatch was on?
- 13 A. The center. If you go down the, the stairs to the engine
- 14 room, that means you're going toward the stern, hang a right and
- 15 then another right, and it went right in the center. It goes to
- 16 the main on each side.
- 17 Q. Okay. Help me understand this. You -- did you ever enter
- 18 | that hatch?
- 19 A. Yes, because that's the, the only way you could put a visual
- 20 on all the bilges to make sure there's no water that shouldn't be
- 21 in the boat there.
- 22 Q. Okay. This is a different -- is this a different compartment
- 23 then the actual voids that run on either side of the vessel?
- 24 A. Say that again, sorry.
- 25 \parallel Q. My understanding there was two voids that ran port to

- l starboard the length of the vessel.
- 2 A. Do you have any pictures of the engine room? I -- maybe I can better show you if you have one.
- 4 Q. I don't, I don't -- off the top of my head, I know we have
- 5 | a -- Lieutenant, could you please pull up the -- maybe the
- 6 stability, stability report 2019. And members of the Board, if
- 7 you had a better suggestion for an exhibit, please come forward.
- 8 Thank you. So, Lieutenant, could you please bring up Exhibit 4,
- 9 page 28?
- 10 | A. Right there, you can see it on the bottom right. That door.
- 11 Q. Okay. Yes. All right. Thank you.
- 12 A. Over (indiscernible) boats are required, so --
- 13 Q. And that was, that was a -- okay. But nothing, nothing else
- 14 | to note during your rounds of the engine room? How were the
- 15 | bilges?
- 16 A. They were clean and clear.
- 17 0. Okay. You had mentioned that -- I don't know if this is a
- 18 direct quote, but -- earlier in your testimony that the ice that
- 19 you've seen accumulate on the vessel was nothing that ever -- that
- 20 ever would have concerned you. How much ice would concern you?
- 21 A. I mean, it's -- depends if you got a full stack on or you got
- 22 a bigger boat.
- 23 0. Full stack.
- 24 A. When, when the web starts building ice, there's some problems
- 25 | happening. I mean, I've been on a boat before where we've had

these suitcase pots, which that's where they're such ice cubes
that you -- the amount of time it takes to keep the door open and
get the line out, seconds can always count there. So we just sent
like a whole, you know, handful over, just never to be seen again
just to get rid of the weight. That's concerning there when you
start seeing it like that.

- Q. Okay. And you had mentioned you'd seen some icing accumulation on the, the chains. Did you ever see any during your watch starting to, to accumulate or accumulating on the webbing or any other -- any other parts of the pots?
- A. I mean, just like -- like I said prior, little kind of fuzzed up a little bit, but nothing, like I said, that, that I would be concerned about.
- Q. Just a couple more questions here, Mr. Lawler. Are you familiar with a personal locater beacon?
- 16 A. Yes.

8

9

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- 17 | Q. Did anybody onboard have one of those?
- A. No. They're cheap enough, everyone should have one, but I don't see them honestly.
 - MR. BARNUM: That's actually all the questions I have for you right now. Thank you very much. I'm going to turn it over to my colleague at the NTSB, Paul Suffern.
 - MR. SUFFERN: Good afternoon, Mr. Lawler. Like my colleague, I appreciate your time and, and your courage speaking with us today. I just have a couple follow-up questions. Earlier during

your testimony you had mentioned you were listening to or watching 1 2 the weather channel during one of your watches. Was that the 3 radio or did you have the TV Weather Channel? THE WITNESS: No, the, the WX channel on, on the VHF. 4 5 MR. SUFFERN: Okay. All right. 6 And then, Lieutenant McPhillips, could you bring up Number 7 026, Exhibit 026 please? 8 During your discussions before departure, did you or any of 9 your colleagues reference or look at any graphics like this that 10 you can recall? 11 No, negative. Not that I can recall. THE WITNESS: 12 MR. SUFFERN: Okay. Thank you. That's all the questions I Thank you, Mr. Lawler. 13 have for right now. 14 THE WITNESS: Sure. 15 CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Barnum. 16 Thank you, Mr. Suffern. Mr. Lawler, at this time, I'm going to pass it to other 17 18 parties in interest for any follow-on questions. And we'll start with Mr. Barcott. Any questions from you, 19 20 sir? 21 MR. BARCOTT: No. Mr. Lawler, thank you for being here. 22 don't have any questions. 23 CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Mr. Barcott. 24 Mr. Stacey, any questions from you, sir?

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

MR. N. STACEY: No questions, Captain.

25

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you, sir. We do have -- I've got a few more questions and my colleague, Commander Denny.

So, Commander Denny, I'll, I'll pass it to you first.

CDR DENNY: Thanks, Captain.

BY CDR DENNY:

2.5

Q. Thanks, Mr. Lawler. So I just want to take a minute and, and let you know that -- I apologize. Thank you. Technical difficulties. So I just wanted to take a minute and, and just thank you for, for speaking about this because I think that every detail that we can get from you is going to help us really paint this picture and get the best possible timeline on what happened.

So I am going to ask you some questions, and I'm going to jump around a little bit, but it's because we want to get as many details as possible. So if you need to close your eyes to try and remember some things, that's okay. I promise that I'm not, I'm not trying to upset you on purpose, but I just have a few questions that will help us --

- A. Right.
- 19 Q. -- better understand how things happened.
- 20 | A. Okay.
 - Q. Okay. So I just want to get some clarification. You said that you got hired for this voyage a little bit in advance, but you said a few days, but you didn't give a timeframe. And then the, the pre-employment drug testing that you took in Anchorage, I believe the timestamp on that said December 23rd. Was that the

- 1 same day you got hired on or --
- 2 A. Yeah.
- 3 Q. -- a day later?
- 4 A. It would have been because they would, they would have asked 5 me to do it right --
- 6 Q. That day?
- A. Yeah, because it was kind of like waiting on the, the word that, good to go, and now it's time to start the process. So that would make sense, I guess.
- 10 Q. Okay. So you took it that day. So the 23rd is the day -- on or about the day that you, you --
- 12 A. Somewhere around there.
- 13 Q. -- got the word to get hired?
- 14 | A. With -- within a, within a day or two.
- 15 Q. Okay.
- 16 A. I would say.
- 17 Q. And then you said that you were on the same flight as Art and
- 18 | Brock?
- 19 A. Art and Brock, and Seth was with us too.
- 20 Q. And Seth was with you too. And so, and so you flew into
- 21 | Kodiak?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And so do you remember what day that was?
- 24 A. I feel like it was the 27th. I mean, I, I don't want to be
- 25 (indiscernible) so don't quote -- don't hold, don't hold me to

- 1 \mid that, but I'm pretty sure it was the 27th.
- $2 \mid Q$. Okay. And then you guys went straight from the airport,
- 3 grabbed your bags, and went straight to the truck -- the dock?
- 4 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 5 Q. Where? Dog Bay? In the Dog Bay area?
- 6 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 7 Q. Okay. So you mentioned that, you know, you, you met David
- 8 Cobban there, and he was --
- 9 A. He picked us up from the airport.
- 10 | | Q. Got you. So he picked you up. You guys all went to the
- 11 | boat. You said that it was kind of in a state of -- it was a
- 12 little bit of a mess?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. Because of all the steel everywhere. Do you remember
- 15 anything that stuck out to you about that steel?
- 16 A. Yeah, the --
- 17 Q. Is there anything --
- 18 A. It was pitted -- a lot of it was really pitted out, but --
- 19 and there was a lot of it. Enough for me to ask what was --
- 20 what's this from, you know. It's always a thing of interest. You
- 21 | get on a boat and it has a bunch of cut out steel, so --
- 22 Q. Can you describe to me the size of the pieces that you were
- 23 looking at? Was it like one-by-ones? Was it --
- 24 A. Like one-by-one, yeah, one-foot-by-one-foot of squares,
- 25 | triangles.

- 1 | Q. Just --
- 2 | A. Maybe --
- 3 Q. -- like scrap --
- 4 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- kind of? So when you say that it was pitted, can you describe that for me? Was it rusty? Was it like just visibly
- 7 | scaled?
- 8 A. Scale, real, real scaly. Yes, ma'am.
- 9 Q. Is there anything else that you noticed on that steel?
- 10 A. I can't exactly -- no, just that. But I will note for you
- 11 that I had asked Art about that, and he gave me the, the whole
- 12 story like you guys have been through with the quick fix to the
- 13 weld and everything else. That's why my automatic thoughts about
- 14 why we went down was due to that area, but -- in other
- 15 conversation regarding that, he also mentioned to me that, when
- 16 the boat was down in the shipyard, on the way or, you know, on
- 17 | land, that someone had punched through the hull with a needle gun.
- 18 And I asked him if they'd ever audio gauged it after he was done
- 19 because it's just what -- you should probably do that, right. He
- 20 didn't know. He had to ask David because I quess David was down
- 21 | there at the shipyard helping out. And no one had an answer for
- 22 him there, so --
- Q. Okay. Did you happen to look at the area that had been
- 24 repaired?
- 25 A. Just a glance of it, you know.

- 1 Q. How did it look to you?
- 2 A. A lot of paint. It'd been painted over because I put all the
- 3 -- you know, all the paint stuff was there. Just the goopy paint
- 4 all over it.
- 5 Q. Okay. And so when you guys stacked all that scrapped steel,
- 6 if, if you think about it, give me an average, your best guess,
- 7 about how tall was that stack? How big was that stack?
- 8 A. Two stacks that were probably a foot or more tall.
- 9 | Q. Okay.
- 10 A. Quite a bit of it. It was quite a bit. It was enough that
- 11 it was getting annoying walking around all day.
- 12 Q. Okay. Okay. And then you said that you guys -- the ship's
- 13 crew ended up disposing of it by chucking it overboard?
- 14 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 15 0. At the dock?
- 16 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 17 Q. Do you remember what side of the --
- 18 | A. It, it would have been on the, the same side of the -- the
- 19 | starboard side, the same, same side as where the repair work was
- 20 done.
- 21 \mathbb{Q} . And, and do you recall how, how the vessel was tied to the
- 22 docks?
- 23 A. Tied up on the port side.
- 24 Q. Port side, okay. So on the outboard side you guys dumped --
- 25 A Yes, yes, ma'am.

Q. Got it. Okay. I want to talk to you a little bit about, about your experience level and, and also the, the level of work that you had to do. I mean, you've been in the business for 12 years, and you -- so you've been on, on quite a few boats. So you mentioned a couple things that, that seemed like they might have been peculiar to you. And I don't want to put words in your mouth, so I just want to talk about that a little bit.

You said that when you got to the, the boat, you know, nothing was set up and that you guys had to set up all the pots, you had to rig all the pots and -- with the triggers, that that took a really long time and that you guys were working 18-plus hour days. At one point, you said 20 hours in that day and well into the night. I want you to, to think about when you were at the dock at Trident and tell me how you felt. Was, was it cold out? I mean, obviously, I know that it's December in Alaska.

16 A. Yeah.

2.5

- Q. But, but based on all of your experience, was it unusually cold?
 - A. I, I would, I would say yeah. I remember when we left Dog
 Bay to go over to the Trident Dock, you know, it was howling
 pretty good through there. And it was enough to where everyone
 came down on deck and like hid in the (indiscernible) because we
 got a little heater in there just for that little crossing.
 Trying to duck out of the, you know, a little bit of the weather
 that, you know, we're just crossing the way, but why stay out and

- 1 | freeze your face, you know.
- 2 Q. So for all of that rigging of the pots, you were out in the
- 3 weather, right? You were --
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 0. -- out on deck on --
- 6 A. On deck.
- $7 \mid Q$. -- on the dock?
- 8 A. Or on land.
- 9 Q. And so you were rigging and putting pots on, rigging and
- 10 putting pots on?
- 11 A. Yeah, and that part's nothing new. Rigging pots, I wasn't
- 12 | trying to say that. I was just -- the -- our time -- or a lot of
- 13 time scheduled to rig over. We rigged over the whole stack. Like
- 14 | there -- and we were trying to -- you know, have to get out of
- 15 | town, so --
- 16 Q. So it seems to me --
- 17 A. That's not -- I mean, we'd fly out a few days earlier.
- 18 Q. So I'm getting the sense, so please tell me if I'm
- 19 misunderstanding, but it seems like you felt and that the other
- 20 crew members had a sense of urgency?
- 21 A. Well, yeah.
- 22 | Q. It --
- 23 A. We're trying to make a fishery.
- 24 Q. And -- but who told you that, right? Like, where was that
- 25 sense of urgency coming from?

- I mean, I didn't talk to Gary much, but like Brock and Art, 1 2 you know, we need to get these on and get going. So like I said, it made sense to me. Like I said before, it would -- January 1 3 dump gear, last -- the year prior it was done by the 6th. So, you 4 5 know, we got so many days of travel before we can get out there 6 and even dump the gear, let alone make a trip out of it.
 - And you know -- would you be able to say how many days of travel you would have had before you could have gotten on the grounds and, and dumped the gear?
- 10 Well, depending on the weather, I mean, three to four, three to five, depending on how -- what we're doing. 11
- 12 So if you guys -- so you guys left on the 30th. So if it would have been even three days, you wouldn't have gotten there 13 14 until the 2nd or 3rd?
- 15 Α. Yeah.

20

- Is that fair? Which would have given you three days to fish? 16
- Yeah, that's -- you know, we got to get all the gear off 17 18 first, let it soak, and then we might have -- I mean, by way of numbers, maybe had enough time to run through the gear once or 19 twice and that would, would have been it.
- 21 Right. Thank you. So you're back at the dock and you're 22 working, and I'm just really trying to get a sense of what that, 23 what that weather and environment was for you. What do you remember as far as your recollections about the weather? Was it 24 2.5 -- you mentioned it was howling on that short transit.

- 1 raining? Was it just super windy and cold?
- 2 A. It was windy and cold. I think we had a little, little bit
- 3 of sleet going on one day, I believe.
- 4 Q. Okay.
- 5 A. It's hard --
- 6 Q. So --
- 7 A. -- to remember back that, you know, to, to that part of it,
- 8 but I mean, the, the part that's ingrained in my head is --
- 9 Q. I'm with you. So where I'm trying to go with this is do you
- 10 | remember that while, while you were loading pots, what is your
- 11 recollection of the way that ice was either sticking to or, or not
- 12 | to --
- 13 A. In town?
- 14 Q. -- pots in town?
- 15 A. It wasn't sticking to the pots.
- 16 Q. At all?
- 17 | A. No.
- 18 Q. So there wasn't even a little bit of a glaze --
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. -- when you were in town?
- 21 A. None at all.
- 22 Q. So it was just super cold and -- but no ice accumulation of
- 23 | any kind?
- 24 A. Right, there wasn't the spray to really make that happen.
- 25 You know, the -- we're not traveling, you know, and bumping into

- $1\mid\mid$ it, having the spray kick up from the sea.
- 2 Q. But not enough from the sleet or the temperatures to be cold 3 enough to ice anything up?
 - A. Yeah, no.

4

- $5 \parallel Q$. Okay. So you mentioned Mr. Gamby was on the crew originally.
- 6 When did he get in, do you remember?
- $7 \mid A$. He, he flew in with us. So (indiscernible).
- 8 Q. Oh, he did?
- 9 A. So there -- yeah, he flew in with us too. There was a -- 0 everyone flew in except for David. David lived there.
- Q. Okay. So it was you, Art, Brock, and Dillon, and, and David came and picked all four of you up?
- 13 A. Yeah.
- 14 Q. Okay. Got you. So about -- after you guys flew in, about
- 15 how many days was it before Mr. Gamby no longer was employed on
- 16 | the vessel?
- 17 A. I believe that was on the 28th when that happened. I believe
- 18 Mr. Gribble came in on the 29th, the next day.
- 19 Q. Okay. Okay. So then you mentioned that, for three to four
- 20 days straight, you were working 18- to 20-hour days, and you were
- 21 | -- I believe your comment was like, you, you were, you were dog
- 22 | tired, you were very tired because you had said that -- that's,
- 23 that's the kind of hours you pull when you're underway and
- 24 fishing.
- 25 A. Right.

- Q. During the transit from after you left Kodiak and during the transit before the accident, do you -- did you feel more rested?

 I know that you were doing wheel watch --
- $4 \mid A$. Well, it was --

- 5 Q. -- a little bit more relaxing.
 - A. -- when we left, Gary, you know, navigating. It's his boat, he's going to navigate out. That, that -- a lot of this, it's six to eight hours of sleep, so the math of that, good to go for my watch.
 - Q. Okay. So you got six to eight hours of down time, which was good, and then it was your watch timeframe. And then I just want you to take just a minute or two to just think back to that very first watch so that we could get a good sense of the weather conditions that you remember. So just take a minute and think back to that first watch.
 - A. It was nasty out on -- even on the other side there. Even though we were a little (indiscernible), but it was still nasty out. It was just like Gary said it was going to be. It was going to be shitty, and it's going to get shittier. Essentially that's pretty much close enough to what he said, so -- and, and he -- and his reference to that was on the -- you know, being on the -- having some cover, then being out in the open.
 - Q. When you were up on the bridge, do you remember, do you remember looking at any of the, the equipment onboard the, the bridge to ascertain where you were? Could you give me a rough

estimate of where you were, where the vessel was in relation to other islands? Did, did you look at that or were you just, like, I'm -- I'm steering a course?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- Well, I always look at it. I believe on my first watch the -- Kodiak was on the port, stern, you know, miles back. And then the next watch we were out in the open, probably three quarters of the way to Sutwik. That area.
- Okay. And so, on your second watch, how had the weather conditions -- to the best of your recollection, how had the 10 weather conditions changed?
 - Bigger seas, starting to see some -- a little bit of ice buildup, but like I said, nothing I was worried about. The one thing that concerned me a few times laying in my rack was with that weather, I kept feeling what -- it's a new, it's a new boat -- or a new boat to me, but I -- and I, I worked on a schooner before. And when you're in a following sea, you got to shudder the hull. Does that make sense? Am I making sense here? It, it shudders when, you know, it picks it up and comes down.

And I was feeling that on this boat when it started getting bigger weather. And now thinking back on it, I don't know if that's the general way that that boat rode or, or if we had already accumulated some water in the hull somewhere where it was that slack feeling in that void because it should shudder. And then it'd pick us up and shudder again.

From your experience, based on your experience, what would Q.

- 1 you, to the best of your recollection, say the sea state was on
- 2 that second watch?
- 3 A. The what now? Sorry.
- 4 Q. The sea state. Like you, you know, you're describing that
- 5 the waves got bigger.
- 6 A. Oh.
- 7 Q. The sea state got bigger.
- 8 A. No, we were --
- 9 Q. What were you estimating?
- 10 A. Twenty-five, 30.
- 11 Q. Twenty-five, 30 foot --
- 12 A. Foot.
- 13 0. -- seas?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Okay. And what do you remember about the wind?
- 16 A. It was blowing towards the starboard side or kind of
- 17 quartering us a little bit. All, all the weather was coming,
- 18 picking up to the starboard bow, but just (indiscernible) quarter
- 19 | into it.
- 20 Q. Do you remember if the Scandies Rose had any equipment
- 21 onboard the bridge that would tell you how strong the winds were?
- 22 A. I did not see that on there, no.
- 23 Q. Okay. But from your experience, it was --
- 24 A. There's, there's not --
- 25 | Q. -- more wind?

- A. You, you can -- no, I mean, I, I couldn't give you an exact number, but you hear it against the house and like you kind of
- 3 -- over the years, you get kind of a gauge. I'd say it sounded
- 4 like it was whipping 50, 60 out there.
- 5 Q. Okay. I'd, I'd like to kind of get a sense of -- you know, I
- 6 think everybody has a relative term of what's a lot, what's a
- 7 little, especially when it comes to ice accumulation. So I'd like
- 8 to get an exhibit pulled up so that you can tell me, to the best
- 9 of your recollection, if it was about the same, a little less, a
- 10 | little more, that -- okay.
- 11 A. Well, when I say a little, it's because it hadn't coated
- 12 everything.
- 13 Q. Okay.
- 14 A. It was just on a little bit here, a little bit there, and a
- 15 quarter, quarter inch, if that. Enough to just be able to
- 16 visually see it finally.
- 17 | Q. Okay.
- 18 A. That it just started to, you know, show its face a little
- 19 bit.
- 20 Q. Okay. So do you recall if, when you were standing out there,
- 21 | you're standing on watch, you're looking at everything -- you said
- 22 | that there was a partial obstruction based on the configuration of
- 23 the pots. Could, could you see all the way to the bow?
- 24 A. If you're in the captain's seat, yes, you can.
- 25 | Q. And do you sit in the captain's seat when you're on watch?

- 1 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 2 \mathbb{Q} . So, so you were able to see down to the bow and the weather,
- 3 there was no precipitation? It was just super windy, but you
- 4 could see all the way? It wasn't like --
- 5 A. Yes, ma'am.
- $6 \mid Q$. -- the weather was restricted or the visibility was
- 7 restricted. Is that a fair statement?
- 8 A. The, the visibility you said?
- 9 Q. Was the visibility restricted because of, let's say, snow or
- 10 | sleet or anything like that?
- 11 A. Not on my last watch, no. I could see every -- I could see
- 12 | the whole entire boat as -- in its entirety.
- 13 Q. Okay. But it was still very windy?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And you estimate, you know, 50, 60?
- 16 A. Yeah.
- 17 Q. Okay. Lieutenant McPhillips, could you actually pull up the,
- 18 | the pinnacle images?
- 19 CAPT CALLAGHAN: Lieutenant McPhillips, I believe it's --
- 20 CDR DENNY: And so --
- 21 CAPT CALLAGHAN: -- 093.
- 22 THE WITNESS: Nothing like that.
- BY CDR DENNY:
- 24 Q. Okay. So you're saying a lot less than this?
- 25 A. A lot.

- 1 0. Is that fair?
- 2 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 3 Q. Okay. Can we scroll down a minute? I just want to see if
- 4 there's -- how about that? If you're --
- 5 A. Zoom in on that --
- 6 Q. From the bridge, is that --
- 7 | A. -- please?
- 8 0. Go ahead.
- 9 A. So the way that, that block looks over there with the
- 10 (indiscernible) and everything --
- 11 Q. Let's zoom in on that for Mr. Lawler. Let's zoom in.
- 12 A. It was less than that on, on the gear, on, you know, the
- 13 working gear on the side of the boat, and the pots looked about
- 14 like, like that pot in front of us, maybe like that there. That's
- 15 about sprinkles.
- 16 | Q. Okay.
- 17 A. The forward of that boat looks like there's a lot more ice
- 18 | than the one on -- and on the port side way than I thought I saw.
- 19 We had nothing like that.
- 20 | Q. Okay. And to the best of your recollection -- so we're
- 21 | talking about the second watch, right? Still the second watch.
- 22 You're telling me that what you remember seeing at -- on, on the
- 23 pots was something like that for your second watch?
- 24 A. My last watch.
- 25 Q. For your last watch? Okay. Do you remember if it was even,

- if that was your observation --
- 2 A. No, because --
- 3 Q. -- across the pots?
- A. -- it wasn't even like that. There was a little bit on the,
 the chains that were laying over and then a little bit on -- you
 know, because we were taking close to the weather to the, the
 starboard side and just kind of dispersed throughout the stack,
 like on the, on the cross bars and --
- 9 Q. So --

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Well, I could have scraped it off with, with my thumbnail, you know. Like, like just -- if that makes sense. I, I don't know how to explain it. It wasn't -- you -- even if you went out there with an ice mallet and you hit it, it's not really going to do anything at that point.
 - Q. Okay. So you've been, you've been a fisherman for, for 12 years and you said you owned your own boat. If you were the captain of, of the *Scandies Rose* and you had seen the ice accumulation that you saw -- we can go ahead and take that down, thank you -- that you had seen that the accumulation that you observed, as a captain, would you have -- what would your decision have been? Would you have been like, okay, crew, let's get out of there and break some ice, or what would you have thought in that regard?
 - A. I would have done some mitigation before we left town, but what I saw out there -- well, on my last watch, I would -- it

would have been more of a hazard to the crew to send them out there in that weather than the ice was. So there was like not enough to -- especially with no alleyway like we spoke about earlier. Climbing over the stack, everything, and there's barely enough to beat off the grablock. It's not worth the time going out there at that point.

Q. Okay.

2.5

- A. With what I saw. I don't know what happened, you know. I saw -- it was so quick when we actually went down that, you know, I don't know how much more it had actually grown. As you know from past experience, it can happen really quick too.
- Q. Okay. That's fair. We're just -- again, just trying to understand and get as many details as possible for a timeline of how this happened. So you, you did just say something that I, I wanted to ask you about. You said you would have mitigated before you got out of town. What do you mean by that?
 - A. Well, I -- there's some people that believe in tarps and stuff, some people that don't. My friend happened to send me a picture of their whole boat with their whole stack completely tarped off, and they were over in the -- I think they were over in King Cove. And, you know, that's like a sign of what we were heading for. So I'm not in charge, though.
- 23 Q. But you did say that you mentioned it to Captain Cobban?
- 24 A. I had, yes.
 - Q. And you showed him the picture you said?

- 1 A. I did, yes. Yes, ma'am.
- 2 \mathbb{Q} . Okay. I want to take us back to, to when you said that, you
- 3 know, you guys were waiting to get underway because, you know, you
- 4 were waiting for the tide. You said that only Mr. Gribble donned
- 5 the immersion suit.
- 6 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 7 Q. Is that normal on -- based on your experience working in
- 8 different fishing vessels?
- 9 A. Generally, yeah, there's one guy that gets picked out and
- 10 | it's always like, you know, he got picked. I didn't get picked.
- 11 We get to watch him out in the --
- 12 Q. Okay. And then you mentioned that -- and I think I may have
- 13 misheard you, but you mentioned that Art was spending a lot of
- 14 time in and out of the engine room. Do you know what he was
- 15 doing? Did he mention?
- 16 A. Just probably general engineer stuff. He didn't mention, but
- 17 | I would imagine -- you know, we'd just got back to town. He --
- 18 went and -- laid the boat up. Maybe he hadn't got his oil changes
- 19 in yet, so maybe he was working on those. Hard, hard to say.
- 20 can't really tell you what he was doing, honestly.
- 21 \ Q. Okay. I just was wondering if he was going in and out, maybe
- 22 you saw him in the galley or like if you heard some conversation?
- 23 A. No. I mean, we, we would talk, but just not any -- about
- 24 anything that he was currently during in the engine room.
- 25 | Q. Okay. So when did you did talk, did he seem perturbed or

- 1 concerned about anything?
- 2 A. No, just that one thing that, like I said, we got to town.
- 3 was asking about the steel. He was a little thrown off that they
- 4 had to, you know, fix it again for -- the whole story was that
- 5 they tried to make a fix, and then it leaked again. And he -- I
- 6 think he just mentioned that he hopes that it's actually
- 7 | successful this time.
- 8 Q. So did Art sound -- when he told you that story, did he sound
- 9 like he was part of that temporary fix?
- 10 \mid A. I, I don't recall if he sounded like he was part of it. He
- 11 knew about it. He was in the know.
- 12 Q. Oh, I was just wondering if you remember if he was telling it
- 13 in the third person or if it -- like I was part of this or --
- 14 A. Oh, I --
- 15 | Q. -- I, I, I --
- 16 A. I imagine he was telling it first person, but, you know, it
- 17 | happens a lot on boats. Like sending someone to go fix something
- 18 and then talk about -- everyone talks about that guy fixed that,
- 19 but didn't really get fixed, you know.
- 20 Q. Okay.
- 21 | A. That seems to be a big problem for -- need to be things
- 22 checked, double checked.
- 23 Q. Okay. So -- okay. I, I need to ask a couple of hard
- 24 questions. So when you were in your rack, did you have top or
- 25 | bottom rack?

- 1 A. I had the bottom rack.
- Q. Okay. And then you said that Dean came in. You, you -- he relieved you?
- 4 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 5 Q. Right? So Mr. Gribble relieved you. And did you do an 6 engine room round at the end of your --
- $7 \mid A$. Yes, I did one in the middle and one in the end. Yes, ma'am.
- 8 Q. Okay. And do you remember seeing anything out of the normal
- 9 on your engine room round when you, you know, got off watch?
- 10 | A. No, ma'am. The boat was trim, no water in the bilge. Well,
- 11 I mean, there's always usually just a little bit right below the
- 12 shaft there.
- Q. Do you remember hearing anything that was abnormal, see
- 14 anything leaking that was abnormal?
- 15 A. No, just that -- like I told you, laying in my rack that
- 16 | night, some time during that bad weather, you could -- I don't
- 17 know how to explain the sounds, but riding up and then coming
- 18 down, you'd, you'd feel the (indiscernible). And then, you know,
- 19 first time on the boat, maybe that's how it rides normally. You
- 20 know, boats make different noises. The way they ride, they all
- 21 ride different.
- 22 Q. Okay.
- 23 A. But it could have been something similar, so I'm, I'm not
- 24 going to throw that out the door.
- 25 \parallel Q. So then about -- you said you stood an hour, hour watches, so

- about an hour later, Mr. Gribble came back to your guys' room and you were watching the movie on, on the computer?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

- Q. So you guys -- so then you -- did you give Mr. Gribble back
 the computer and you were -- you said because you were nodding off
 at, at that point?
- A. Yeah, no, he came in -- no, I, I -- that was my computer. He gave me an SD card to put the movies on. But he stepped up to go up to his bunk and just the usual, hey, man, how was your watch, you know. Just banter. And then we laid there and we talked for a second and then just nodded, nodded off. I don't think it was -- I think I just nodded off because I was going --
- Q. Okay. Did -- do you remember if Mr. Gribble mentioned how his watch went?
- A. There was nothing of significance that he talked to me about and just Gary's up and out. That was it. I think I asked -
 because I think I did ask. I was like, who -- is Gary up there or who's up there now? And I think I do remember him telling me that. But I already -- that was the list. That's the way the list went.
- Q. Okay. And remind me again, did, did -- when you got off your third watch, was there any list at all that you recall to the vessel?
- A. We never had a list the, the whole trip other than that one right at the beginning when we were leaving where I picked -- we

- l were just transferring some fuel.
- $2 \parallel Q$. Okay. And did Mr. Gribble mention any list at all --
- 3 A. Not to me.
- 4 0. -- when he came on?
- 5 | A. No.
- 6 Q. Okay. So when you felt that really hard lean over, tell me 7 what you did hear -- and you jumped out of your rack and you said
- 8 that you ran up to the bridge. Tell me what you did hear.
- 9 A. I didn't hear anything. I just knew. Just a feeling. I --
- 10 the pit in your stomach. And the door was closed, and when I
- 11 opened the door, it was swung open, you know, smashed the side of
- 12 | the, the other wall because it -- we were leaning over so hard.
- 13 | Then I, I ran up the stairs sideways, you know, climbing like
- 14 this. And I was, I was out of my rack and up in the wheelhouse
- 15 | within -- I'm a pretty big quy, but I probably would -- two
- 16 seconds I was up there. I mean, I, I flew out of my bunk because
- 17 I just knew. It was obvious that something was not right.
- 18 Q. And you said that, that Captain Cobban had just keyed up the
- 19 mic to the sat phone, to the sat phone?
- 20 A. Yeah, he was talking to Austin (ph.) on the, the civic
- 21 | sounder. I only know that because I remember hearing him say
- 22 | Austin's name.
- 23 Q. Okay. Did he say Mr. Loan's (ph.) first name or last name?
- 24 A. His first name.
- 25 | Q. And, and you know Mr. Loan from previously or --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- from the industry?
- A. Like the whole thing, like out in the industry. And people, people know names even if you don't know them personally. You hear about people.
- Q. So you heard Captain Cobban say Mr. -- Captain Loan's name.

 Was there any other conversation at all? Did you hear any other
 part, any other words that he said?
- 9 No, just the name on the first one and then -- trying to 10 remember back. I'm pretty sure I remember him -- which was 11 confusing to me, you know. I get that he's trying to talk to 12 someone, but he said -- he had said -- I don't remember the exact words he used, but he, he -- in, in a few words, he basically let 13 14 Austin know that something was not right. And I don't remember 15 what the exact sentence was. So he was communicating through the 16 sat phone about our current state, which our current state was 17 there was no coming back from it. I mean, you've been on boats 18 long enough, you know that once you get to a certain degree, it's not coming back. It's time to go. 19
- Q. So you're saying that like you knew, deep inside you, you knew already at that point?
- A. Oh, it's like I got punched in the gut, and I just lost all wind.
- 24 Q. Were all the lights off on the bridge?
- 25 A. Yeah, that's how we travel.

- 1 Q. At night?
- 2 A. You got to be able to see out the window. I mean, you can
- 3 turn your red lights on.
- 4 Q. Were the red lights on, do you remember?
- 5 A. They weren't, no.
- 6 Q. Okay. Do you remember hearing the generators or the engines
- 7 at all when you were up there on the bridge? Could you hear --
- 8 and I'm just trying to --
- 9 A. That, that, that --
- 10 Q. -- get a sense --
- 11 A. That hum, yeah.
- 12 Q. Did you hear anything?
- 13 A. But I mainly heard them when we were outside and they ran
- 14 away -- I want to say run away, but the RPMs just spiked and
- 15 started smoking up the stack.
- 16 | Q. Okay. So --
- 17 CAPT CALLAGHAN: Commander Denny, I'm, I'm going to ask for
- 18 | just to -- sorry to interrupt. I'm going to ask that we take a
- 19 quick, quick recess, maybe two minutes and then come back at 1655
- 20 and sort of wrap things up.
- 21 (Off the record at 4:52 p.m.)
- (On the record at 4:57 p.m.)
- 23 CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. The time is now 1658. The hearing's
- 24 | back in session. At this time, I'd like to ask Lieutenant
- 25 McPhillips if you could bring up Exhibit 046 please. And can you

scroll down to the second page, Lieutenant?

LT McPHILLIPS: Sure.

BY CAPT CALLAGHAN:

- Q. Mr. Lawler, the -- and maybe the first page is probably -- or no, that's good. The, the bottom picture is good. Mr. Lawler, looking at that bottom picture there, so if, if you were in the wheelhouse and, and your visibility down the starboard side and, and forward, would you be able to see the extreme port side forward of the pots from your, your vantage point?
- $10 \parallel A$. No, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

16

17

18

19

25

- Q. Okay. Thank you. Lieutenant McPhillips, you can bring that down. Earlier, you made a comment regarding some -- an incident with a needle gun being mentioned to you. Can you maybe tell us more who you got that from and, and where they indicated that, that incident had taken place?
 - A. I heard from that from Art Ganacias, and the -- he said that had taken place down south. But I think -- well, I don't think, I was told that also David was calling up, probably pissed off too about the whole situation. Just like my own detail I heard, so --
- 20 Q. Did, did he happen to indicate where in the, where in the
- 21 | hull that it might have happened?
- 22 A. I can't say to that.
- 23 Q. Okay. No, thank you.
- 24 A. Under the waterline somewhere.
 - Q. And so once you, once you guys got back to land and you got

- 1 | to the hospital, who, who met you at the hospital?
- 2 A. It was Gerry Cobban.
- 3 Q. Okay.
- 4 A. Well, she had showed up and the, the nurse came in and asked
- 5 if it would be okay if, if she came in.
- 6 Q. Okay. And had you met her before?
- 7 A. No, sir.
- 8 Q. And, and what capacity was she, was she there visiting?
- 9 A. She -- sorry, I don't know what --
- 10 | | | Q. Do you know what capacity she was there visiting?
- 11 A. She just asked to visit us, and I assumed it was she wanted
- 12 the story of what happened, and I, I was not thrilled with --
- 13 obviously not thrilled, you know, but I just didn't want to be the
- 14 guy that delivered the, the news.
- 15 Q. Okay. And, and when you're at the, the hospital, aside from
- 16 the doctors looking you over there, did anything else occur while
- 17 you were at the hospital?
- 18 A. Just the IV that I had been given. I -- it's not really
- 19 relevant, but I had a blood clot in my arm after that I had
- 20 | to go to the hospital for upon returning home.
- 21 \mathbb{Q} . And that, that was after you returned home from that?
- 22 | A. Yeah, but it, it occurred out there. That's the only
- 23 | occurrence that I can think of that would have taken place in the
- 24 hospital or on the way to the hospital.
- 25 Q. Okay. And at any point did -- were you asked to take a drug

- or alcohol test following the incident?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.

5

- 3 Q. Lieutenant McPhillips, can you bring up Exhibit 80 please?
- 4 And, Mr. Lawler, does -- do you recognize this?
 - A. Yeah, it's -- this is it.
- 6 Q. Does that resemble the test that you were asked to take?
- 7 A. Yes, sir. I believe she -- well, she, she had asked if we
- 8 needed anything, and clearly we needed something to wear because
- 9 we didn't have any clothes on. Everything was soaked, so the
- 10 | clothes -- little clothes we did have. And then she had showed
- 11 back up to the hospital with two Target brand drug tests and said
- 12 | that we had to pee on them.
- 13 Q. Okay. And do you remember what the results were there?
- 14 A. Mine passed. There I can see two lines all the way down.
- 15 Q. Thank you. Lieutenant McPhillips, you can, you can bring
- 16 that down. Thank you, Mr. Lawler. So, at this time, I want to
- 17 ask you -- and, and so this is not the easiest question to answer,
- 18 but it's something that's very important for us to get out of
- 19 this. As a survivor, are there any specific training items or
- 20 | experiences that you would attribute to you being able to don your
- 21 | immersion suit and, and get out of the vessel?
- 22 A. Well, I have plans to write you guys a whole list on things,
- 23 | and I just don't really want to go into that right now. But I got
- 24 to stop talking about -- I mean, if I had any piece of advice to
- 25 give, just to keep moving. Don't freeze. I, I don't -- I'm just

as human as everyone else. I'm, I'm sure that, you know, some extensive training or, or some sort of training would help where it becomes muscle memory over time. I mean, that's what the military does for people, and it becomes second nature. And a lot of that stuff that happened to us is not second nature. It doesn't happen until it happens, and then everyone's surprised.

2.5

- Q. So along those lines, is there anything from, from your perspective as, as a survivor who went through this horrific incident, is there anything -- any, any questions that you think we didn't -- we failed to answer, but that we -- that should be brought to our attention here during this hearing?
- A. No, I think you guys are doing a really thorough job. And, and like I said, I have some things on, on my mind, and I'll probably pass over to you later, but at, at this point, no.
 - Q. Okay. And, and then my follow-on to that is, are there any recommendations -- and, and I know this is not easy, but are there any recommendations that, that you would make that might help prevent such an incident in the future?
- A. Verbally, right now, no. But like I said, I'd, I'd be more than happy -- I do have things in my head that I'd like to share later. This is too much right now.
 - Q. And, and we would certainly welcome that, and we certainly appreciate that. And, and as I mentioned, as a survivor, you know, we have a, we have a unique opportunity to learn from you and your experience so that we can do the best we can to complete

the most thorough investigation possible so that we can make the most informed recommendations to improve safety of life at sea for, for the rest of the fishing fleet and -- so we don't have just tragic incidents with loss of life. And --

A. Yeah, and, and I'll say, I, I have -- and, and I can see what's been happening and, you know, the, the hearings you're doing is, is perfect. Like I've told a few people, I, I don't want people to be saving face but rather saving lives. So if we can keep on that course, I think that would be the best for everybody.

Q. Absolutely. Thank you, sir.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: And, sir, Mr. Stacey, as, as counsel, I'd ask that we just continue to, to follow up and if we can continue that conversation and, and we can get any of those recommendations from you as a follow up, we'd ask that you work through Lieutenant Pels and, and we can make that part of the investigation.

MR. J. STACEY: Of course, Captain. As Mr. Lawler has already said, he and Mr. Gribble are very anxious to help out in any way that they can to help out the, the families, as well as the Coast Guard and the future mariners. So anything we can do to help, these, these gentlemen would be happy to do so.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Again, sir, I, I can't begin to express enough condolences to you and explain our gratitude enough for your willingness to come here and share your story, not only to us, but to the public so that everyone can better understand what

happened and that we can affect change down in the future. So thank you. And again, we offer our deepest condolences on behalf of the Marine Board here at the Coast Guard for the loss of your shipmates and, and the experience that you, you went through.

So we are -- at -- this concludes our time -- our testimony for you today. However, I anticipate that you may be recalled to provide additional testimony at a later date. Therefore, I'm not releasing you from your testimony at this time, and you do remain under oath. So please do not discuss your testimony or this case with anyone other than your counsel or members of this Coast Guard Marine Board of Investigation. If you have any questions about this, you may contact my legal advisor, Lieutenant Sharyl Pels, through your attorney.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

2.5

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Thank you very much, sir.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.

CAPT CALLAGHAN: The record shows it is now 1708. We're going to take a brief recess and come back at 1710. We'll reconvene.

(Off the record at 5:08 p.m.)

(On the record at 5:11 p.m.)

CAPT CALLAGHAN: Okay. It's now 1711. The hearing's back in session. I wanted to take this opportunity to come back from recess and thank all of our witnesses for their testimonies today. Again, for the record, all exhibits that were presented today will

Again, as -- thanking all the witnesses today. I want to

be posted on the MBI website at, at -- upon conclusion today.

recognize that this is a rare, unique opportunity for us as a Marine Board to learn from a survivor and, and hear the tragic events that occurred and just the experiences and learn as much as we can.

So, at this point, it is now 1712 on February 24th. The hearing will now adjourn for today and resume at 0800 tomorrow, February 25th.

(Whereupon, at 5:12 p.m., the hearing was recessed.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceeding before the

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF: Marine Board of Investigation

Into the Sinking of the Scandies Rose

On December 31, 2019

PLACE: Seattle, Washington

DATE: February 24, 2021

was held according to the record, and that this is the original, complete, true and accurate transcript which has been compared to the recording accomplished at the hearing.

Kelly Anne Treado Vance

Transcriber